

RITUAL REVISION AND THE INFLUENCE OF EMPIRE:
THE POLITICS OF CHANGE IN THE *ZUKRU*
FESTIVAL OF LATE BRONZE EMAR

by
John Tracy Thames, Jr.

A dissertation submitted to Johns Hopkins University in conformity with
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Baltimore, Maryland

October, 2016

© 2016 John Tracy Thames, Jr.
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Late Bronze Age Emar was a city in transition. The textual archives discovered at the site span a period when local governance was overtaken by the Hittite Empire, which only gradually developed a presence in Emar throughout the 13th century B.C.E. During this time, cultic specialists in Emar were engaged in a project of committing instructions for performing rituals to writing. Five of those documents record a city-wide ritual called *zukru*. Four of them are near-identical copies, relating a modest ritual engagement that may have occurred yearly. The fifth reflects an event of an altogether different scale, self-described as a septennial festival, with a level of extravagance unseen elsewhere in Emarite ritual.

Studies of such prominent public events as the *zukru* tell us more than just details of religious practice. Following the work of ritual theorists who have investigated rituals as expressions of politics, this study offers a perspective on the *zukru* rituals as politically significant engagements not unrelated to the political transitions contemporary with their authorship. Changes in the rituals, such as those attested for the *zukru* ritual, may reflect alterations in the political landscape. Likewise, understanding their political settings helps us assess the significance of the rituals themselves. This study seeks such a comprehensive understanding of the *zukru* rituals by interpreting them first as religious phenomena, using comparative methods and ritual theory, and subsequently by reconstructing the political history of 13th-century Emar to reveal the rituals' implications for Emarite politics and the policies of the Hittite authority based in nearby Karkamiš (Carchemish).

The results of the study indicate that the festival form of the *zukru* was heavily influenced by the ritual sensibilities of the Hittite Empire, which took a political interest in Emar around the same time that it became a frontier city of the Assyrian Empire. The expansion of the *zukru* ritual into an elaborate festival occurred with the backing of the Karkamiš authority as part of a broader program of support for Emar's local monarchy and cultic service, apparently for the purpose of producing stability in the farthest reaches of the empire.

Advisor: P. Kyle McCarter, Jr.

Second Reader: Jacob Lauinger

Committee Chair: Nicolas Jabko

Readers: Daniel Fleming
Theodore Lewis
Paul Delnero
William Rowe

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Politics of power are shaped in many less than obvious ways, perhaps none so fundamental to human experience than through ritual practice. Yet, the dimensions of ritualization and its dynamic properties are not routinely considered in historical assessments of political change, such as the emergence of empires. Consequently, our historical narratives of political domination in the ancient Near East lack an essential component for understanding fully, on the one hand, the nature of imperial infiltration in provincial territories and, on the other hand, the ways in which ritualization can be a means of negotiating social power. Likewise, a study of ritual is incomplete without as fully as possible taking into account the political, historical, and social factors that would have shaped its form and influenced the impact it would have produced for its participants. A goal of this research is to demonstrate both the profitability of studying ancient rituals for understanding contemporary politics and the advantages of seeking out the socio-political setting of ritual practice in order to best appreciate its significance.

The *zukru* rituals of Late Bronze Age Emar are particularly well suited for an investigation of this sort. They are public events, apparently involving the entire populace of Emar, sponsored by public institutions. And they attest to a shift in their manner of observation that appears to be connected to the dramatic political transitions underway in 13th-century B.C.E. Emar as a result of the increasing presence of Hittite imperial apparatuses in the city. Hence the *zukru* rituals give us the opportunity to pose questions whose answers may be less accessible in other types of ritual texts. What is the relationship between the variant versions of the *zukru* ritual and how may we account for its changes? What historical factors would have motivated the production of the *zukru*

texts in precisely the form we know them? Given what we know of Emarite government, with its traditionally modest monarchy, how can we explain the exorbitant injection of wealth into the *zukru* festival—absent in the non-festival version—on the part of the king? And, perhaps most important of all, how does the fact that Emar performed its public *zukru* while under the imperial umbrella of Hatti and, more immediately, the Hittite viceregal kingdom of Karkamiš (Carchemish) inform us of Hittite/Karkamiš policy concerning Emar, its cult and its governing institutions?

Despite the fact that the Hittites conquered Emar already in the last third of the 14th century, their exercise of control in the region was slow and measured, occurring only when politically expedient. One such measure was an active involvement in support of Emar's cults and the ritual activity associated with them, including the alteration and expansion of the *zukru* ritual. But why invest in provincial religious service without the possibility of material returns? The question of what the dominant power had to gain from its injection into Emar's system of religious ritual and precisely how such benefits were achieved will be the driving question of the work that follows.

* * *

I have had the privilege of completing this work thanks to the support of many individuals, without whom it would never have been possible. My doctoral advisor, Kyle McCarter, played a hands-on role in the project from its very nascence. His continued guidance throughout the process of shaping, reshaping, researching, and writing was always exceptional and forthcoming. I count myself fortunate to have learned from not only his intellect but his example these last years.

Daniel Fleming of New York University agreed early on to consult with me on the project and his involvement grew to be nothing short of crucial. Despite having no obligation to me as a student, he generously gave of his time, spending entire days with me discussing aspects of Emarite society, taking on the role of a mentor. He also read every draft in detail; there is hardly a page in this book that hasn't been reshaped to respond to his challenges. I am indebted to him for the great amount of time, energy, and kindness he has given me.

Jacob Lauinger also donated much of his time to help strengthen the penultimate draft. The level of detail with which he read, especially for the Akkadian text editions, was striking; many an error was expunged thanks to his work. Ted Lewis was foundational to shaping my interest in Late Bronze Age religion and ritual practice; I developed the earliest designs of working on these issues under his guidance. Yoram Cohen met with me during his travels in New England and graciously shared with me his forthcoming work.

Discussions with Elizabeth Knott and Dylan Johnson—colleagues in an Emar studies reading group—have been particularly beneficial for ensuring accuracy and depth in my use of academic work on Emar. Paul Michael Kurtz has read a number of documents related to this work and has never failed to offer useful and insightful criticisms. My frequent conversations with Paul Allen have always provided informative perspectives and a much-appreciated sense of fellowship during what was at times an isolating endeavor. And my colleague and friend, Erin Guinn-Villareal, who worked with me via Skype for the majority of my dissertation-writing days, has been a constant source

of support, motivation, and intellectual inspiration since we began studying together our first years at Johns Hopkins.

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to thank my family for the countless gifts they have given me. Gus and Amos, who were both born during stages of this project, had, far and away, a bigger impact on my work than any other individuals. Their constant (and successful) attempts to pull me away from my desk were always welcome distractions. Learning and playing with them and watching them master so many skills with ease is an inspiration. Finally, I struggle to find the words to express adequately my gratitude to Wendy, my wonderful and patient wife. I started graduate school in the same month we were married and through a decade of successive schools she has stayed by my side as my most ardent supporter. Her sacrifices have been many; it is only with thanks to her that I have had the freedom to pursue this demanding work. I hope that I am able to repay her a small fraction of the grace she has given me as we continue the journey of our lives together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
PART I: THE CITY OF EMAR AND ITS <i>ZUKRU</i> RITUALS	
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE CITY OF EMAR	1
Archaeological Excavations at Tell Meskeneh	3
The Archives of Emar	9
Emar's Scribal Distinctions	16
CHAPTER 2: THE <i>ZUKRU</i> RITUAL: THE CITY'S OFFERING TO DAGAN	19
Texts and Translations:	
Emar 375+ 397 + 401 + 428 + 448* + 449*	20
Text A: Textual and Philological Notes	33
Text B: Textual and Philological Notes	54
Text C: Textual and Philological Notes	55
Text D: Textual and Philological Notes	56
The <i>zukru</i> Ritual of the City of Emar	57
Gods and Men in the <i>zukru</i> Ritual	60
The Performance of the <i>zukru</i> Ritual	65
Dagan on Parade: The Processional Rites	66
"They Will Smash Their Clods"	70
Between the <i>sikkānu</i> -Stones: The <i>zukru</i> 's Sacred Space	75
Anointing the Stones with Blood and Oil	83
Performing the Glorification Ceremonies	88
Donations to the Gods	94
Politics and Food: Feasting in the <i>zukru</i> Ritual	95
Emar 375+: Two Interconnected Rituals?	97

The Interval Between Shorter <i>zukru</i> Performances	100
Copying Rituals	103
CHAPTER 3. THE <i>ZUKRU</i> FESTIVAL: EXPANSION OF LOCAL TRADITIONS	105
Text and Translation:	
Emar 373 + 374 + 376 + 424 + 425	106
Textual and Philological Notes	127
The <i>zukru</i> Ritual in its Festival Version	161
<i>zukru</i> Festival Divinity	163
The Deities of the Palace	200
The Completeness of <i>zukru</i> Divinity	204
The Ritual Transaction: Donations to the Gods	216
The Sponsors of the <i>zukru</i> Festival	222
The <i>nupuhannū</i> -men	234
The <i>zirāti</i> -men	238
The Provisioning of the <i>zukru</i> Festival	240
Animal Offerings: Prestige in Quantity and Quality	240
Offerings of Foodstuffs: Underlying Indications of Hittite Involvement	246
The Performance of the <i>zukru</i> in its Festival Form	253
All the Gods on Parade: The Processional Rites	253
Feasting and the New <i>zukru</i> Sponsorship	261
Veiling the Face of Dagan	263
Anointing the Stones with Blood and Oil	268
Sacred Space and Dagan's Perambulation at the <i>sikkānu</i> Gate	272
Days of Consecration	275
PART I CONCLUSION	
The meaning of the word " <i>zukru</i> "	278
The <i>zukru</i> rituals: A Synthetic View	281

PART II: POLITICS AND RITUALS

CHAPTER 4: EMAR IN THE LATE BRONZE AGE: HISTORY, POLITICS, AND CHRONOLOGY	287
North Syria in the Late Bronze Age	288
Local Politics of Emar:	
The Conventional Format Documentation	297
The Hittite Conquest of North Syria	312
The Role of Hittite Karkamiš in Emar Politics:	
Evidence of the Free Format Documentation	316
The Relationship between Local and Foreign Authorities:	
Chronological Considerations and Political Change	330
CHAPTER 5: POLITICS, POWER, AND THE <i>ZUKRU</i> FESTIVAL	349
The King and the <i>zukru</i> Festival	349
<i>zukru</i> Practice under Hittite Aegis	353
Hittite Involvement in Emar's Cults	361
Cults of Anatolian Deities at Emar	375
The Hittite Interest in Emar's Cults	379
Historical Context and the Dating of the <i>zukru</i> Texts	383
CONCLUSION: POWER, POLITICS, AND CHANGE IN THE <i>ZUKRU</i> RITUALS	396
BIBLIOGRAPHY	404
CURRICULUM VITAE	426

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AAAS</i>	<i>Annales archéologiques de Syrie</i>
<i>AASOR</i>	<i>Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>AB</i>	Anchor Bible
<i>AEM</i>	<i>Archives épistolaires de Mari</i>
<i>AEP</i>	<i>Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes-Études, Section des Sciences Historiques et Philologiques</i>
<i>AHw</i>	Wolfram von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965-1981)
<i>AION</i>	<i>Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli.</i>
<i>AOAT</i>	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
<i>AOB</i>	Altorientalische Bibliothek
<i>AoF</i>	<i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i>
<i>ARET</i>	Archivi reali di Ebla. Testi.
<i>ARM</i>	Archives royales de Mari
<i>ARMT</i>	Archives royales de Mari, traduction
<i>AuOr</i>	<i>Aula Orientalis</i>
<i>AuOrS</i>	Aula Orientalis Supplements
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BaM</i>	<i>Baghdader Mitteilungen</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BBR Supp.</i>	Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements
<i>BM</i>	Bibliotheca Mesopotamica
<i>BZAW</i>	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>BoSt</i>	Boghazköi-Studien
<i>CAD</i>	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago</i>
<i>CHANE</i>	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
<i>CM</i>	Cuneiform Monographs
<i>CTH</i>	Catalogue des textes hittites
<i>CRAI</i>	Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres
<i>DBH</i>	<i>Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie</i>
<i>ETCSL</i>	Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature
<i>FAT</i>	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
<i>FM</i>	Florilegium marianum
<i>GAG</i>	W. von Soden, <i>Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik</i> (Analecta Orientalia 33; Rome, 1952)
<i>GKC</i>	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> (ed. E. Kautzsch; trans. A.E. Cowley)
<i>HdO</i>	Handbuch der Orientalistik
<i>HSS</i>	Harvard Semitic Studies
<i>IOS</i>	Israel Oriental Studies
<i>JANER</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>

<i>JCS</i>	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JRitSt</i>	<i>Journal of Ritual Studies</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi
KTU ³	M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, <i>Die keil-alphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten</i> 3 rd edition = AOAT 360/1
KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi
<i>M.A.R.I</i>	<i>Mari, Annales de Recherches Interdisciplinaires</i>
MBQ-T	<i>Tall Munbāqa-Ekalte: Texte</i>
MC	Mesopotamian Civilizations
<i>MDOG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-gesellschaft zu Berlin</i>
MEDA	Middle Euphrates Digital Archive
MVAG	Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen
MVEOL	<i>Mededelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"</i>
<i>N.A.B.U.</i>	<i>Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires</i>
PIOL	Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain
<i>PRU</i>	<i>Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit</i>
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta
<i>OrNS</i>	<i>Orientalia, Nova Series</i>
<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale</i>
<i>RGTC</i>	<i>Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes</i>
RIMA	The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Assyrian Periods
<i>RIA</i>	<i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie</i>
<i>SAAB</i>	<i>State Archives of Assyria. Bulletin.</i>
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SCCNH	Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians
<i>SEL</i>	<i>Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico</i>
<i>SMEA</i>	<i>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici</i>
StBoT	Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten
<i>StOr</i>	<i>Studia Orientalia</i>
THeth.	Texte der Hethiter
TSO	Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik
<i>UF</i>	<i>Ugarit Forschungen</i>
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World
YOS	Yale Oriental Series
<i>ZA</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>

ABBREVIATIONS FOR TEXTS FROM EMAR AND ITS VICINITY

AuOrS 1	Arnaud, Daniel. <i>Textes syriens de l'âge du bronze recent</i> . AuOrS 1. Barcelona: Editorial Ausa, 1991.
ASJ 6	Tsukimoto, Akio. "Eine neue Urkunde des <i>Tili-Šarruma</i> , Sohn des Königs von Karkamiš." <i>ASJ</i> 6 (1984): 65-74.
ASJ 12	Tsukimoto, Akio. "Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (I)." <i>ASJ</i> 12 (1990): 177-259.
ASJ 13	Tsukimoto, Akio. "Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (II)." <i>ASJ</i> 13 (1991): 275-333.
ASJ 14	Tsukimoto, Akio. "Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (III)." <i>ASJ</i> 14 (1992): 311-15.
Iraq 54	Dalley, Stephanie and Beatrice Teissier. "Tablets from the Vicinity of Emar and Elsewhere." <i>Iraq</i> 54 (1992): 83-111.
CM 13	Westenholz, Joan. <i>Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem: The Emar Tablets</i> . CM 13. Gronigen: Styx Publications, 2000.
Emar	Arnaud, Daniel. <i>Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Emar VI.1-4</i> . Synthèse 18, 28. Paris: ERC, 1985-1987.
Fs Kutscher	Sigrist, Marcel. "Seven Emar Tablets." Pages 165-85 in <i>kinattūtu ša dārāti: Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume</i> . Edited by Anson Rainey. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University, 1993.
PdA	Fales, Frederick Mario. <i>Prima dell'Alfabeto: la storia della scrittura attraverso testi cuneiformi inediti</i> . Venice: Erizzo, 1989.
RA 77	Huehnergard, John. "Five Tablets from the Vicinity of Emar." <i>RA</i> 77 (1983): 11-43.
RE	Beckman, Gary. <i>Textes from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen</i> . History of the Ancient Near East Monographs 2. Padova: Sargon, 1996.
SMEA 30	Daniel Arnaud. "Tablettes de genres divers du moyen-Euphrate." <i>SMEA</i> 30 (1992): 195-245.
SMEA 45	Salvini, Mirjo and Marie-Claude Trémouille, "Les textes hittites de Meskéné/Emar." <i>SMEA</i> 45 (2003): 225-71.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	<i>Excavation Data for Emar 375 Manuscripts</i>	21
Table 2	<i>Orthographic Variations among the Manuscripts of Emar 375+</i>	33
Table 3	<i>Incipit Formulae for Rituals</i>	34
Table 4	<i>Excavation Data for Emar 373+ Textual Components</i>	109
Table 5	<i>Patterns of Foodstuff Offerings</i>	124
Table 6	<i>The Declension of gabbu in Relation to Grammatical Function</i>	135
Table 7	<i>“When the Emarites...”</i>	160
Table 8	<i>A Synoptic Presentation of the zukru Festival Text</i>	165
Table 9	<i>Deities of the First Tier</i>	206
Table 10	<i>Deities of the Third Tier</i>	209
Table 11	<i>Multiple Attestations of Gods in the Hierarchical God-List</i>	213
Table 12	<i>Deities Occurring Once in the Hierarchical God-List</i>	213
Table 13	<i>Divine Titles without Divine Names and Possible Attributions</i>	214
Table 14	<i>Total Provisions in Emar 373 and Their Sources</i>	224
Table 15	<i>Offering Inventories Sourced from the Temple of the Gods</i>	228
Table 16	<i>Sacrificial Animals Provided for the Month of Niqalu, Year Six</i>	243
Table 17	<i>Sacrificial Animals Provided for the Month of SAG.MU, Year Seven</i>	243

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION TO THE CITY OF EMAR

The city of Emar, located at the site now known as Tell Meskeneh Qadime, is situated in northern Syria west of the Euphrates at the corner of the great bend of the river. The site lies fifty-seven miles (ninety-one kilometers) south-east of Aleppo, seventy-five miles (121 kilometers) east of Ebla, fifty-nine miles (ninety-four kilometers) south of Karkamiš and 185 miles (298 kilometers) north-west of Mari, as the crow flies. Much of the site was submerged by the man-made Lake Assad, a reservoir created by the construction of the Tabqa Dam near the city of Raqqa. But the most southerly part of the tell as well as the northwestern high point remained exposed. More recently, Lake Assad has shrunk due to increased flow of water through the dam for generation of hydro-electric power, as war has destroyed other sources of electricity. In 2014, the water level reportedly dropped twenty feet (six meters) below average. Although more recent measurements are not available, satellite photos reveal that the retracting waters have left more of the site's surface perimeter exposed, particularly in the northwest quadrant.

Meskeneh Qadime is situated on the edge of the Euphrates River valley, which borders the site to the north and east. To the northwest and the south, wadis cut into the soft limestone form natural borders, with drastic promontories lying both on the northwest and southwest of the site.¹ Prior to its partial submergence, the tell had a roughly triangular shape. The southeastern third of that triangle was dominated by a medieval Islamic occupation called Bālis, with the rest of the site preserving Bronze Age levels of Emar.

¹ Jean Margueron, "Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Emar (1972-1974): un bilan provisoire," *Syria* 52 (1975): 56-58.

The existence of an important city called Emar has long been known through its mention in texts discovered at nearby Syrian sites as well as in the core of Mesopotamia. Prior to the Late Bronze Age (LBA), the city was usually known as Imar.² Imar is one of the most frequently mentioned place names in the third millennium documents from Ebla, where the royal families were linked through dynastic marriage.³ The city was well known in Old Babylonian Mari, the archives of which reveal attempts to conquer and exploit Imar and other upstream regions on the Euphrates.⁴ These give a picture of Imar as caught between the larger regional powers, such as Aleppo and Karkamiš, in addition to Mari, itself. Notably, there are no references to any royal institution at Imar in the Mari records. Mari's dealings with Imar were often conducted with a collective governing body (*taḥtamum*), a form of which persisted into LBA Emar, designated in Emar's own documents as "the Elders."⁵ Finally, in the roughly contemporary LBA archives of Alalakh (IV) and Ugarit, Emar was occasionally recorded, sometimes with references to regional trade, though often as a localization with little historical value.⁶

Among the most important contributions to our understanding of ancient I/Emar are the several copies of an Old Babylonian itinerary that records a standard trade route from southern Mesopotamia into Syria, listing weigh stations and travel times along the

² All but a single document from Alalakh in the Old Babylonian period (level VII) vocalize the name of the city as *E-mar*; cf. *RGTC* 12.2, 69-70. Jacob Lauinger has called my attention to the outlier, AIT 456, a very early level VII text, which uses the vocalization, *I-mar*. The rest of the texts mentioning Emar stem from a later phase of level VII. As Lauinger observes, these texts effectively carve out a four-generation span of Alalakh level VII during which the pronunciation of "Imar" shifted to "Emar."

³ See Alfonso Archi, "Imâr au III^{ème} millénaire d'après les archives d'Ebla" *M.A.R.I.* 6 (1990): 21-38.

⁴ Matthew Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and Their Tablet Collection* (Ancient Magic and Divination 9; Leiden, Boston: Brill: 2013), 46-47.

⁵ The term *taḥtamum* never occurs in the LBA Emar documents, which could be simply a terminological development or, on the other hand, could indicate some kind of structural shift in the operations of the body.

⁶ Cf. *RGTC* 12.2, 70.

way. The twenty-seven day journey, which made its way by land into northern Mesopotamia and eastern Syria before taking to the Euphrates to sail the final stretch south, ended in the very heart of Emar.⁷ From there, as can be discerned from the Mari texts, as well as the Alalah and Ugarit references, traders would shift to a westward route to Aleppo and on to the Mediterranean.⁸ Emar occupied the important position of standing at the crossroads between Mesopotamia and the overland route to the sea, which would have afforded access to the southward trade routes through Palestine and the Transjordan, as well. While Emar is not known to have been a major regional power nor an outstandingly wealthy state, its strategic importance was no doubt economic, as it connected Mesopotamia with the western world.

Archaeological Excavations at Tell Meskeneh

The initial excavations of Emar were undertaken as part of an international salvage operation aimed at documenting and excavating sites whose accessibility would be threatened by the creation of the Lake Assad reservoir. The prominent Islamic architecture at Meskeneh Qadime, which included remains of Byzantine ramparts and an Ayyubid minaret, made it a choice site for investigation, so in 1970 excavations were first undertaken by the Institut Français d'Études Arabes de Damas to investigate the medieval occupation of Bālis.⁹ In 1971, a promontory at the northern tip of the site (outside of the confines of Bālis, itself) that had been disturbed by illicit excavations came to the attention of the excavators. Noting that the ceramics there were inconsistent with those of

⁷ William Hallo, "The Road to Emar," *JCS* 18 (1964): 57-88.

⁸ Hallo, "The Road to Emar," 81. Cf. Albrecht Goetze, "The Syrian Town of Emar," *BASOR* 147 (1957): 22-27.

⁹ Jean Margueron, "Les fouilles françaises de Meskéné-Émar (Syrie)," *CRAI* (1975): 202.

the medieval occupation, the team conducted a sounding, which revealed materials, including a single cuneiform tablet, that left no doubt that a second millennium B.C.E occupation had been discovered.¹⁰

Excavation of the Bronze Age occupation of the site was entrusted to the direction of Jean-Claude Margueron. The French expedition to Emar commenced in 1972 and undertook six campaigns over the subsequent four years. The dam began to restrict the flow of the Euphrates in 1974, starting the slow process of filling Lake Assad. The excavation team continued to work until 1976, when the rising waters finally became a threat to the site.¹¹

Because of the urgent circumstances of the excavation, the team conducted a large number of soundings across the site, following as quickly as possible the most pressing discoveries of each area and abandoning without hesitation those which appeared non-productive.¹²

The first trench was opened at the northern tip of the site, in the location where the cuneiform tablet had been discovered by the Bālis team. This unit would later be given the name *Chantier A*. It was an important area, yielding the remains of a large structure that Margueron eventually identified as a *bīt hilani* style palace¹³—an identification that has since been challenged on several fronts.¹⁴ Less than a week into the

¹⁰ Jean Margueron, “Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Emar,” 54.

¹¹ Jean-Claude Margueron and Veronica Boutte, “Emar, Capital of Aštata in the Fourteenth Century BCE,” *BA* 58 (1995): 127.

¹² Margueron, “Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Emar,” 59.

¹³ Jean Margueron, “Une «*hilāni*» à Emar,” *AASOR* 44 (1977): 153-176. Margueron had already recognized the affinity with *bīt hilāni* style architecture several years prior; cf. “Les fouilles françaises de Meskéné,” 206.

¹⁴ Cf. Thomas McClellan, “Houses and Households in North Syria during the Late Bronze Age” in *Les maisons dans la Syrie antique du IIIe millénaire aux débuts de l'Islam: pratique et représentations de l'espace domestique: actes du Colloque International, Damas, 27-30 juin 1992* (eds. Corinne Castel et al.; Beirut: Institut Français d'Archéologie du Proche-Orient, 1997), 30-31; Lorenzo D'Alfonso, “Urban

initial excavations, a jar containing a small cache of cuneiform tablets was discovered almost at surface level, having been stowed in a niche in a wall in antiquity.¹⁵ These tablets allowed the dig epigraphist, Daniel Arnaud, to identify the site as Emar with work only barely beginning.¹⁶

Several other jars containing cuneiform documents were discovered in *Chantier A*; these were assembled and edited by Arnaud as text numbers 1-22 in *Emar VI.3* under the heading “Le Palais.” But, the occurrence of members of Emar’s second royal house in the witness lists of some of these documents notwithstanding, as Matthew Rutz has noted, there is “no textual reason to associate the building exclusively with the royal family of Emar. Although by the standards of the domestic architecture of the site and region, the so-called ‘palace’ has few, if any, monumental features and nothing to distinguish it as royal.”¹⁷ No excavated building at the site has emerged as a more plausible candidate for the local palace, which is now likely underwater.¹⁸

Another important excavation area, *Chantier E*, was opened in 1973 and visited once again in 1974. This area sits atop the highest point of the tell: the apex of the southwestern promontory. Here, two temples were discovered, parallel to one another,

Environment at 13th Century Emar: New Thoughts about the Area A Building Complex” in *Proceedings of the 4th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East, 29 March – 3 April 2004, Freie Universität Berlin*. Vol. 1 (eds. Hartmut Kühne et al.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008), 65-76.

¹⁵ Margueron, “Les fouilles françaises de Meskéné,” 205; *ibid.*, “Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Emar,” 60.

¹⁶ This identification confirmed the proposition that Georges Dossin had made nearly twenty years prior that Meskeneh Qadime was the site of Emar [“La site de la ville de Kahat,” *AAAS* 11-12 (1961-1962): 199].

¹⁷ Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 64. It is true that Emar’s “palace” does not match its counterparts known from other excavations, as Thomas McClellan noted in his study of domestic structures (“Houses and Households,” 30-31). But looking to conventional “royal distinguishing features” to assess what is palatial at Emar may be problematic, since its monarchy seems to have been traditionally a somewhat limited office. Even with a modified expectation of what Emar’s palace might look like, however, the building in question seems not to match the needs of the palace presented by the texts. Cf. Daniel Fleming, “Textual Evidence for a Palace at Late Bronze Emar” in *Organization, representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg, 20-25 July 2008* (ed. Gernot Wilhelm; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 107.

¹⁸ Cf. Fleming, “Textual Evidence for a Palace at Late Bronze Emar,” 108.

built along an east-west axis. The structures revealed *in antis* construction and thick, monumental walls, where they were preserved. Based on inscriptional finds and figurines in the buildings, the southerly temple, rising slightly higher than the other, was identified as belonging to Ba‘lu. Its counterpart was then identified as the temple of Aštartu, his divine partner. At the rear of the temples lay an open area—a cultic terrace—with a feature at the edge of the promontory identified by Margueron as a sacrificial altar.¹⁹ This area appears to have been the most prominent cultic installation in the city.

Finally, what is undeniably the most important discovery at Emar was made, once again, by the excavation team of Bālis. After the Emar team’s departure in the fall of 1973, the Bālis excavators were working in a medieval cemetery west of the main Islamic occupation when they unearthed a cache of cuneiform tablets and other Late Bronze age materials numbering more than four hundred in inventory. As a result of this important discovery, the Emar team returned to the site as early as the spring of 1974, when it focused its attention on this new area, labelled *Chantier M*.²⁰

When the excavation of this area was undertaken in earnest, on the basis of what appeared to be an altar similar to those of *Chantier E*, Margueron identified the structure which contained the tablets as yet another temple.²¹ From the beginning, however, several differences from the other temple buildings were apparent. It had additional rooms built along one side, less developed interior installations, and, rather than being isolated like the pair of temples belonging to Ba‘lu and Aštartu, it was integrated among the domestic structures that surrounded it.²² Nonetheless, the building was labeled by its

¹⁹ Margueron and Boutte, “Emar, Capital of Aštata,” 132.

²⁰ Margueron, “Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Emar,” 55, 65-66.

²¹ Margueron, “Les fouilles françaises de Meskéné,” 209.

²² Margueron, “Les fouilles françaises de Meskéné,” 209.

excavators as “Temple M₁,” and it is under this name that its archives are published in *Emar VI.3*.²³

After a long, slow rise and even a temporary abatement during a drought in 1975 when the dam was opened to provide water downstream in Iraq, the waters of Lake Assad began to lap at Meskeneh in 1976, making that year the final campaign of the French expedition.²⁴ But when the reservoir reached its maximum extent, all accessible areas of the LBA town had not been inundated. A 10-12 hectare portion of the southern town, situated on a natural elevation, remained entirely exposed, as did a small high point on the northern side (*Chantier A*), where some of the so-called *bīt ḥilāni* building remains exposed.²⁵ But the partial conservation of the site was a mixed blessing, because with the excavators departed and the importance of the site by this time well known, the remnant of the tell lay an open field for looters. During the late 1970s and through the 1980s, a great amount of illicitly excavated materials were removed from the ground and circulated on the antiquities market.

Recognizing the systematic destruction of the site, in 1992, the Syrian Department of Antiquities renewed excavations at Emar on a small scale. Upon determining that significant portions of the site remained yet undisturbed, the excavators partnered with Tübingen University to initiate the joint Syrian-German excavations of Emar in 1996 under the direction of Uwe Finkbeiner. The team conducted five campaigns between 1996-2002.

²³ The identification of this building as a temple has been the topic of intense scrutiny, recapitulated most recently by Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 303-308.

²⁴ Jean Margueron, “Rapport préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e, 5e, et 6e campagnes de fouilles à Meskéné-Émar,” *AAAS* 32 (1982): 241.

²⁵ Uwe Finkbeiner and Ferhan Sakal, “Introduction” in *Emar after the Closure of the Tabqa Dam* (eds. Uwe Finkbeiner and Ferhan Sakal; Subartu 25; Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), ix.

The Syrian-German excavations were concentrated in three areas: the “Temple Area” (French *Chantier E*), the “Upper Town” (French *Chantier D*), and a section of the city fortification wall (French *Chantiers K* and *R*) located south of the “Lower Town.”²⁶ The most consequential finding of these excavations is chronological. During the French expeditions, no material was ever found to date prior than LBA. The absence of discovery of earlier levels led Margueron to theorize that the site of Meskeneh Qadime was new in the LBA. However, since Emar is well known in textual records elsewhere to have existed already in the third millennium, he imagined that the original site of the town must have been lower in the valley, nearer the river. He surmised that the original city must have been endangered by the meanders of the Euphrates, necessitating a wholesale rebuilding of the town on higher ground. This relocation would have been undertaken under the direction of the Hittite rulers, either Šuppiluliuma I or his son Muršili II.²⁷

But the Syrian-German excavations dispensed with this hypothesis through a few modest discoveries. In a deep sounding in the Upper Town and in a broader exposure in the Temple Area under the temple of Ba‘lu, both ceramics and architecture dating to the Early Bronze Age were discovered. Remnants of Middle Bronze Age levels were also found to the far west of the site, at the city wall that abuts the Temple Area.²⁸ Owing to these finds, it is clear that the site was a continuous occupation in the Bronze Age,

²⁶ Details regarding the method of excavation, stratigraphy, and architecture are now available in volume two of the Syrian-German final excavation report, which was still inaccessible at the time of completion of this dissertation. Cf. Finkbeiner and Sakal, *Emar After the Closure of the Tabqa Dam*, ix.

²⁷ Margueron and Boutte, “Emar, Capital of Aštata,” 128.

²⁸ Uwe Finkbeiner, “The Samples: Find Context and Meaning for the Chronology of Emar,” in *Emar after the Closure of the Tabqa Dam* (eds. Uwe Finkbeiner and Ferhan Sakal; Subartu 25; Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 257. Uwe Finkbeiner and Ferhan Sakal, “Emar 2002—Bericht über die 5. Kampagne der syrisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen,” *BaM* 34 (2003): 65-90.

leaving no need to envision massive injections of imperial resources into the construction of an alleged New Emar.

The Archives of Emar

During the excavations of the French expedition to Emar, more than a thousand tablets and tablet fragments were unearthed. In the decade following the close of the excavations, these texts were published by Arnaud in four volumes (*Emar* VI.1-4), which presents the documents organized principally by their findspot and, as subcategories, by genre. A broad range of textual genres are included among the archives, including legal (land-sale contracts, adoptions, testaments), administrative, epistolary, and ritual documents, as well as “canonical” Mesopotamian literature, much of which would have been used for scribal education, such as lexical series, omen compendia, and incantations.

While the exemplars of the Mesopotamian canon of literature include texts written in both the Akkadian and Sumerian languages, the entirety of the texts of local authorship were written in Akkadian, despite the fact that the local population of Emar actually spoke a West Semitic dialect.²⁹ A very small number of the documents were composed in Hurrian or Hittite.³⁰

The inscriptional finds of the French expedition derive from six excavation areas, with a few outliers.³¹ *Chantier A* produced two distinct archives, one in the large building

²⁹ Cf. Eugene Pentuic, *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar* (HSS 49; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001); Ran Zadok, “Notes on the West Semitic Material from Emar,” *AION* 51 (1991): 113-137.

³⁰ For the Hittite texts, see Mirjo Salvini and Marie-Claude Trémouille, “Les textes hittites de Meskéné/Emar,” *SMEA* 45 (2003): 225-71. For the Hurrian texts, see now Mirjo Salvini, *Les textes hourrites de Meskéné/Emar. Vol. I: Transcription, autographies, planches photographiques* (Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2015).

³¹ Single tablets were unearthed in at least two areas, which can scarcely be called an “archive.” One of these is an important Hittite letter, *SMEA* 45:2, which comes from a sounding in *Chantier N. Chantier R*

identified by Margueron as a palace and another in a domestic structure called “La Maison A V.” The so-called palace archive consists of twenty-two texts (Emar 1-22), characterized by legal documents related especially to the transfer of immovable property. As has already been noted, these documents are not especially related to members of the royal family, though they are present as witnesses or principal actors in some.³² Especially interesting is Emar 17, a legal text that includes a historical preamble revealing an attempted coup against the king Zū-Ašarti. Two important official decrees (Emar 18-19) also belong to this archive (found in the same jar as Emar 17), one issued by Ini-Teššub, the Hittite king of Karkamiš who acted as viceroy for the Syrian holdings of the empire, and another by his brother, Hešmi-Teššub—both regarding the same matter.

The “Maison A V” archive (Emar 23-29) is a small, but distinctive assemblage of documents. They evidence a variety of paleographic, orthographic, and grammatical features, as well as personal names and systems of dating that are otherwise foreign to Emar. It is clear that the documents of this archive come from several distinct points of origin. As most of these texts involve financial transactions, it is possible that this archive “provides evidence of the activities of foreigners in Emar who may have lived in a trading station at the edge of the mound.”³³

also yielded a single tablet, Emar 536, which Arnaud identified as the sole Old Babylonian text in the Emar archives, which are otherwise written in a Middle Babylonian vernacular. That identification has since been overturned; cf. Jean-Marie Durand and Lionel Marti, “Chroniques du Moyen-Euphrate 2. Relecture de documents d’Ekalte, Émar et Tuttul,” *RA* 97 (2003):152-156. Other texts, such as Emar 41-42, were discovered on the surface, rather than through excavation.

³² See Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 63-64.

³³ Yoram Cohen and Itamar Singer, “A Late Synchronism between Ugarit and Emar,” in *Essays on Ancient Israel in its Near Eastern Context* (eds. Yairah Amit et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 131.

Ten texts along with a large collection of ceramics were discovered in *Chantier C*, on the northern edge of the tell east of *Chantier A*. Various types of legal texts are included, as well as several fragments of lists of personal names and an inscribed hematite weight (2/3 *mina*). This area also yielded an extract of the lexical text *ur₅-ra = ħubullu*—the only scholarly text found outside of the M_I archive. Matthew Rutz has tentatively suggested that the structures in *Chantier C* be interpreted as storage facilities.³⁴

In the sacred precinct of *Chantier E*, inscribed objects were found in both the temple of Ba‘lu and that of Aštartu. The former contained twenty-one documents (Emar 42-62), most of which are related to the maintenance of cult. These include inventories, etiquettes, administrative notes, and lists of personal names. One tablet (Emar 42) bears copies of three dedicatory inscriptions that would have been engraved on cultic vessels donated to the temple by members of the royal family. The temple of Aštartu contained five texts—all lists of personal names, some of which are recorded alongside numerical units.

In *Chantier T*, located approximately at the center of the tell, two domestic buildings were discovered, though the architecture in this area was in general poorly preserved. Thirty-four tablets emerged from this area, though the context of their finds has not yet been clarified. At least some of them came from the single best preserved structure in the area, where a bronze jar was found to contain several documents.³⁵ Since many of the texts from this area, most of which are land sale records, relate to the family

³⁴ Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 65.

³⁵ Margueron, “Rapport préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e, 5e, et 6e campagnes de fouilles à Meskéné-Émar,” 240.

of a man named Hima, this collection seems to represent the Hima family private archive.³⁶

Opened only in 1975, *Chantier V*, located in what the Syrian-German team identified as the Upper Town, was one of the later undertakings of the French expedition. Three houses were found here with many furnishings and goods, including some of stone or bronze manufacture. Twenty-eight tablets (Emar 109-136) were discovered in this area, apparently in two of the three houses. All of the texts are legal in nature, and must represent private archives of the residents of these homes.³⁷

This overview has so far left untouched only *Chantier M*, where more than ninety percent of Emar's textual finds were discovered. A small fraction of these were discovered in the monumental temple known as Temple M₂ (Emar 68-74). Emar 68 is an inscribed bead bearing the name of a deity to whom the temple might have belonged, though the interpretation of the divine name is uncertain.³⁸ The rest of the small archive consists of administrative and legal documents not obviously connected to the operations of the temple, itself. An exceptional find in this building is an inscribed clay foot-impression, related to the sale of a child into slavery. The object, however, was not published along with the rest of the Temple M₂ archive. Noting the connection of this piece with two other foot impressions and a legal document recording the sale—all found in Building M₁—Arnaud opted to group the object into the M₁ archive, publishing it as Emar 220.³⁹ But the recognition of the separate findspots for these objects is important, as

³⁶ For comments on the Hima family and their dates, see Francesco Di Filippo, "Notes on the Chronology of Emar Legal Tablets," *SMEA* 46 (2004): 195.

³⁷ For the distribution of texts in *Chantier V* and their ownership, see Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 78-79.

³⁸ Cf. Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 73.

³⁹ The transaction is recorded in Emar 217. Emar 218-219 are the other two foot impressions. Emar 217 records the sale of four children, so one foot impression, if it was ever made, remains undiscovered.

it demonstrates the connection of the administration of Temple M₂ with the occupants of Building M₁.

The textual findings in Building M₁ are too many and too variegated to describe adequately in any brief summation, though it must be reiterated that the vast majority of texts yielded by Emar derive from this single location.⁴⁰ The collection belonged to the family whose head claimed the title “Diviner of the Gods of Emar,” identified especially with the *pater familias*, Zū-Ba‘la.⁴¹ The archive contains documents related to the economic affairs of the family, including land transactions, testaments, and sales of movable goods/persons. But its scope reaches far wider, containing various administrative documents (some cultic), instructions for the performance of public rituals, and canonical Mesopotamian literature, most of which can be associated with scribal education. In fact, in addition to the cultic administrative role that was obviously enacted by the occupants of Building M₁, the location itself probably also facilitated a scribal school in the later phases of its occupation.⁴² It is primarily the materials in this archive and the activities of its owners that will inform the discussion of ritual performance in the socio-political context of Emar that follows.

Because the primary attention of this study is focused on the ritual texts of the Diviners’ archive, it is necessary briefly to dwell on that text-group. In Arnaud’s publications, the texts numbered Emar 369-535 are considered ritual literature—some 167 tablets and fragments. When multiple copies of the same composition were present in

⁴⁰ For a detailed look at the tablet collection of this building by findspot and by genre, see Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 93-299.

⁴¹ Zū-Ba‘la, himself, is never attested with the full title, calling himself, rather, “Diviner.” His son, Ba‘lu-qarrād, is the first attested with the longer title (Emar 604 1).

⁴² See Yoram Cohen, *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age* (HSS 59; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 54-55, 239.

the archive, Arnaud did not publish them separately but rather brought them together under a single text enumeration and utilized the exemplars to create composite editions of the compositions.⁴³ So, when redundant copies are included, the total number of tablets can be slightly augmented. But when assessing the overall number of ritual texts in the archive, two facts must be considered: (1) since Arnaud's work, a number of the published ritual texts have been shown to join one another and (2) a large portion of the numbered, published texts exist now as very small fragments that, in all likelihood, belong with one of the few longer texts in the archive, despite the fact that too little remains physically and in textual content to propose with confidence any indirect joins to known compositions. Thus, there is certain to be a net reduction in the overall number of texts that would have been present in the archive.

The compositions that are best preserved in the archive include the installation ceremony for the NIN.DINGIR priestess of Ba'lu (Emar 369), the installation for the *maš'artu* priestess (Emar 370), associated with Aštartu of Combat, the *zukru* ritual in its two forms (Emar 373-376+), the *kissu* festivals centered in the town of Šatappu (Emar 385-391), the *imištu* of the king (Emar 392), a ritual of uncertain significance (Emar 393), the "*henpa* of oxen" (Emar 394), the six-month ritual calendar (Emar 446), rites for the month of Abî (Emar 452), rites for Aštartu of Combat (Emar 460), rites for a single month (Emar 463), and several rites for the gods of Hatti (Emar 471-473). Additionally, Emar 378-384 contain lists of divine names used in the provisioning of sacrificial offerings. The roughly 130 remaining publication numbers for ritual texts are

⁴³ E.g. Emar 369, 385-388. The effect of composite editions is that, occasionally, when copies diverge, the composite will contain a "false" text, which exists in none of the actual copies.

fragments—some of which must represent pieces of distinct compositions, but many others of which are likely to belong with one of the longer texts listed above.⁴⁴

All the textual discoveries that have been overviewed to this point are fruits of the labors of the French expedition to Emar and are currently housed in the Aleppo National Museum. During the looting of Tell Meskeneh that occurred especially during the 1980s, many more textual artifacts were unearthed and circulated on the antiquities markets, landing in the hands of private collectors and sometimes non-Syrian museums. A great number of these have been made available in publication by distinguished scholars, though many more are sure to remain at large. Many of the illicitly excavated texts pertain to land transactions, testaments, and other jurisprudential affairs, like so many of their scientifically excavated counterparts. But, on occasion, additions to the ritual corpus are to be found, such as *ASJ* 14 48, a fragment of a *kissu* festival text and CM 13 31, an Anatolian ritual, as well as other cult-related texts such as the cult inventories of CM 13 25-30.

Finally, the renewed excavations of Emar in the 1990s discovered only three tablets, which have not been made fully available in publication. The context of these finds have been given brief descriptions by the epigrapher, Betina Faist, in a preliminary excavation report.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ See Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 158 for an accounting of ritual tablets and fragments, categorized by composition and scribal format.

⁴⁵ Uwe Finkbeiner, “Emar 1999—Bericht über die 3. Kampagne der syrisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen” *BaM* 32 (2001):103.

Emar's Scribal Distinctions

One of the most discussed aspects of the Emar textual artifacts is the physical format of the tablets and the writing they contain. Especially from his work on the legal texts, Arnaud noted that there are two distinct formats in which a document might be drafted: one in which writing runs parallel to the shorter side of a rectangular tablet, and the other inscribed parallel to the long side.⁴⁶ Furthermore, different sealing practices were noted as corresponding to the differences in textual format. Recognizing that the former category often contains texts related to the affairs of local rulers and that the latter is that which includes names of Hittite officers and kings, Arnaud perceived that there was a consistency to this scribal distinction representing separate scribal schools, which he called “Syrian” and “Syro-Hittite,” respectively.

When Claus Wilcke published his paleographic study of selected legal tablets, the depth of the scribal distinction began to be more fully appreciated. Wilcke noted consistent paleographic differences between the text formats in the ductus of certain cuneiform signs.⁴⁷ The signs of the “Syrian” type tablets, when they differed from those of the “Syro-Hittite” tablets, take a form reminiscent of Old Babylonian ductus, resembling the style of Alalah VII, the Old Babylonian period level. The “Syro-Hittite” tablets, on the other hand, contain a script more consistent with the Middle Babylonian ductus in common use during the LBA. Subsequent work expanded the scope of the observable distinctions between the systems⁴⁸ and worked to demonstrate the existence of

⁴⁶ Daniel Arnaud, “Catalogue des textes cunéiformes trouvés au cours des trois premières campagnes à Meskéné qadimé Ouest (Chantiers A, C, E, et trouvaille de surface),” *AAAS* 25 (1975): 87-93.

⁴⁷ See Claus Wilcke, “AH, die Brüder von Emar. Untersuchungen zur Schreibtradition am Euphratknie,” *AuOr* 10 (1992): 115-150.

⁴⁸ Stefano Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar* (Materiali per il vocabolario sumero 6; Roma: Università degli studi di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di studi orientali, 1998), 9-20.

this same scribal distinction, initially noted for the legal genre, in administrative,⁴⁹ ritual,⁵⁰ and scholarly materials,⁵¹ as well.

Arnaud's description of these scribal formats as "Syrian" and "Syro-Hittite" was based on the notion that the former is more purely local and the latter an innovation that accompanied the arrival of Hittite rule in north Syria. But this terminology and the historical picture it implies have recently been challenged. Daniel Fleming and Sophie Démare-Lafont have noted, in the first place, that the "Syrian" system was not a generally Syrian phenomenon. The contemporary archives from Ugarit, for instance, contain no tablets bearing a particular resemblance to Emar's "Syrian" texts. The slightly older texts from Ekalte, a Middle Euphrates town not at all far from Emar, on the other hand, are all composed in a format corresponding to that of Emar's "Syrian" documents. Thus, Fleming and Démare-Lafont prefer to label this scribal system the "Conventional Middle Euphrates" format.

Unlike the Conventional format, the "Syro-Hittite" style does not have an adequate representative in otherwise-known scribal forms. There are no discernable Hittite influences on this type of scribalism, as the name would imply. Moreover, the Conventional system is truly a system: there is a remarkable degree of consistency among the texts of this format in terms of margins, spacing, sign forms, terminology, etc. But the same is not true of the "Syro-Hittite" texts, which lack the features of a system, altogether. This style "is really a 'non-style,' replete with variety and innovation"—"the

⁴⁹ Betina Faist, "Scribal Traditions and Administration at Emar" in *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference* (eds. Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo D'Alfonso, and Dietrich Sörenhagen; AOAT 349; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 195-205.

⁵⁰ Daniel Fleming, *Time at Emar: The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's House* (MC 11; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 109-13.

⁵¹ Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar*.

non-conformist, innovative scribal current that came into its own in the last phase of Emar's existence, before its destruction in the 1180s."⁵² Thus Fleming and Démare-Lafont redub this type of scribalism the "Free Format." It is this updated terminology that I follow in the present work, though it should be noted that the traditional terminology remains, for now, dominant in the field of Emar studies.

Emar's scribal division is more than a curiosity of textual production; it is truly fundamental for the historical study of Emar. The two systems bear witness to different and seemingly unconnected ways of life. Individuals mentioned in one system are, with rare exception, never mentioned in the other. The kings of Emar are only ever mentioned in texts of the Conventional format and the Hittite rulers and officers only appear in the Free Format texts. How the picture of scribalism at Emar is interpreted is inseparable from the discussion of history and chronology and has a special importance for understanding the development of the *zukru* rituals, to which this discussion will now turn.

⁵² Daniel Fleming and Sophie Démare-Lafont, "Tablet Terminology at Emar: 'Conventional' and 'Free Format,'" *AuOr* 27 (2009): 24.

CHAPTER 2
THE *ZUKRU* RITUAL:
THE CITY'S OFFERING TO DAGAN

There are two compositions among the Emar documents whose contents are self-described as a “*zukru*” ritual. One of these, Emar 373+, is a large tablet of four columns, containing 227 lines of text, which must have edged closer to 250 in its original, unbroken state. With explicit date formulae, that text describes a festival (EZEN) that occurred once in seven years, with preparatory sixth-year rites to accompany it. It reflects an impressive ritual that is unrivaled in the Emar ritual corpus in terms of its length, scope, and expense.

The other composition representing a *zukru* event, Emar 375+, is comparatively modest in scale. The text is roughly fifty-five lines, now in a badly broken state. The performance is not characterized as a festival, which is an important point of terminological distinction. This work will use the phrase “*zukru* festival” only with reference to the longer text, Emar 373+. On all accounts, the shorter *zukru* gives the impression of a simpler version of Emar 373+, which is better understood due to its length, detail, and state of preservation. By all indications, Emar 375+ predates the longer, festival *zukru* (see below), and accordingly this study will treat it first as the foundational *zukru* practice.

Because it is clearly fundamental to the development of the *zukru*, this discussion of the shorter *zukru* ritual will present as full and independent of a discussion as possible. But the laconic nature of the text and terseness of its content inevitably require that the interpretation be sometimes referential to its longer counterpart, Emar 373+. Therefore, it is unavoidable that the intertextual comparative task will begin to take shape

immediately, even as a proper analysis of the longer *zukru* will not be undertaken until the next chapter. To reverse the order of the texts' discussion would be unfairly to privilege the longer text. To do so would risk obscuring the intentionally crafted project of expansion reflected in the festival version—a product of specific politico-historical changes that are the subject of this study.

Texts and Translations: Emar 375+ 397 + 401 + 428 + 448 + 449**

“Emar 375” refers to the contents of no fewer than four tablets (three of which are in only fragmentary preservation), which relate the performance of a *zukru* ritual. The number of textual materials that can be included with the composition Arnaud labeled as Emar 375 has grown substantially since the initial publication, primarily thanks to Daniel Fleming’s collations in the early 1990s, when he not only discovered tablet joins¹ but also revealed that Arnaud’s texts numbered Emar 448 and 449, which were published separately despite being inscribed on the back of the same tablets that contained Emar 375, actually belonged with the *zukru* material.²

¹ Fleming has shown that Emar 428 (Msk 74287b) joins directly to the bottom of the most complete exemplar, Emar 375A (*Time at Emar*, 294-95). He also identified Emar 375C “+” Emar 449 (Msk 74303f) and Emar 448B (Msk 74303c) as two, un-joined fragments of the same tablet. Fleming suggests the connection based on matching tablet appearance and script. As opposing right and left edges of the tablet, the textual lineation of the two fragments demonstrates the expected correspondence of a single text (*Time at Emar*, 258).

² For the main tablet, Arnaud published the obverse as Emar 375A and the reverse as Emar 448A, though both belong to the tablet Msk 74298b. Unifying the contents of the obverse and reverse of Emar 375A suggests that Emar 375C (Msk 74303f) also belongs together with its reverse, which had likewise been disassociated and published as Emar 449. It also allows an additional exemplar of Emar 375 to emerge, previously published only as Emar 448C (Msk 74289b, now Emar 375D after Fleming). It is, in fact, this exemplar that confirms the hypothesis that the obverse and reverse of Emar 375A and 375C are a single composition, as it contains a sequence of lines on a single side that transverses sides on Emar 375A “+” 448A: lines 4-5 of Emar 448C, which occur as Emar 375A line 26 and Emar 448A line 1 (= line 2 in Arnaud’s Emar 448 composite edition). The correspondence of lines is difficult to discern to due textual lacunae and some variant, though parallel, terminology (e.g. *harṣī* // *sikkānāti*). It is necessary to read the entire Emar 448C (= Emar 375D) fragment in tandem with Emar 375A to appreciate the depth of the parallel text.

Table 1. *Excavation Data for Emar 375 Manuscripts*³

Excavation No.	Copy	Note	Findspot	Locus ⁴
Msk 74298b	A	= Emar 375 (A) ⁵ , Emar 448 (A)	M ₁ M I SW	3 (, 1)
Msk 74287b	A	= Emar 428; join to 74298b	M ₁ M I SW-SE	3 (, 9)
Msk 74146l	B	= Emar 375 (B)	M ₁ M III SE	1 (, 4, 43)
Msk 74303f	C ¹	= Emar 375 (C), Emar 449	M ₁ M I SW	3 (, 1)
Msk 74303c	C ²	= Emar 448 (B)	M ₁ M I SW	3 (, 1)
Msk 74289b	D	= Emar 448 (C)	M ₁ M I SW	3 (, 1)
Msk 74193d	B or D	= Emar 397	M ₁ M III NE	1 (, 6, 5)
Msk 74286c	B or D	= Emar 401	M ₁ M I SW	3 (, 1)

What is truly striking about the manuscripts of Emar 375+ is their scribal format. Fleming recognized that the best-preserved tablet, 375A, was written in something quite like the Conventional Format of the Emar legal texts—a groundbreaking observation, since the division of scribal formats had not, thereto, been recognized as applying outside

³ The only textual fragment that Arnaud identified as *zukru*-related that is not accounted for in the present editions of Emar 375+ and 373+ is Emar 377. Arnaud did not state his reasons for claiming it belonged to the *zukru*, though I suspect it was the presence of the verb *šamādu*, which only otherwise appears in the Emar 375+ text family (though note, now, the possible form *še⁷-me-da* in CM 13 24:9). However, the surrounding text does not align with anything known from Emar 375+ and the contents are otherwise unfamiliar. Moreover, the triple ruling given beneath line 6 is unlike anything in any of the *zukru* texts, making it a difficult match to any of them. Emar 377 text may not be a ritual document, at all. The verb *nabalkutu*, which occurs in the preceding line, for instance, never appears in any other ritual text. The preterite verb *iddin* in line 6 is also suspicious, since by far the majority of verbal expressions in ritual texts are present tense.

⁴ In the absence of a final excavation report to make explicit the loci of the textual findspots, the locations given here follow the conjectural reconstruction of the M₁ excavation map offered by Rutz (*Bodies of Knowledge*, 111-26).

⁵ Alphabetic designations following the Emar VI.3 text number refer to Arnaud's classification of textual exemplars in his text editions.

of the legal genre.⁶ Only three texts—Emar 375+, 446, and 447—record rituals in the Conventional style.⁷

What was not fully considered until Matthew Rutz catalogued and typologized the entire Emar textual corpus is that Emar 375A is the *only* one of the four manuscripts of Emar 375+ that was inscribed in the Conventional Format.⁸ No other piece of Emarite ritual literature witnesses a change in scribal format when copied.⁹ But this is not the limit to the significance of this phenomenon. The scribal divisions, especially as known in the legal texts, are tantamount to a social division in Emar. With few exceptions, people mentioned in Free Format texts have no recorded contact with people mentioned in Conventional texts. The scribes who wrote them, likewise, did not cross over. At least

⁶ More recently, the scribal dichotomy has been extended to the Emar scholarly literature as well as to the small body of administrative texts. For the former, see Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*; for the latter, see Betina Faist, “Scribal Traditions and Administration at Emar,” 195-205.

⁷ Fleming noted only the first two of these as having Conventional Format, though the sixteen-line fragment published as Emar 447 shows Conventional forms, as well. Rutz correctly categorized Emar 447 as Conventional in his recent catalog of the Emar texts. I arrived at that assessment independently.

⁸ The cuneiform of the B and D texts can be confidently identified as the style of the Free Format by its paleographic features. The C text deserves a bit more consideration. Paleographically, a Free Format identification rests on two signs: a mostly broken IL in line 5 and IG in line 18. The former is too badly broken to be properly analyzed. The latter does take the form of a Middle Babylonian IG, which is expected for the Free Format and is quite distinct from the standard Conventional IG. But a Middle Babylonian-looking IG can be observed in some Conventional documents also (e.g. Emar 176:5 and *RA* 77 1:2, 5; cf. Wilcke, “AH, die Brüder von Emar,” 129-30), which gives pause to the identification of the tablet’s character based on this sign, alone. Fortunately, orthographic considerations can also weight in: twice the tablet prefers CVC signs over text A’s CV-VC, which lends further support to its probable Free Format character. The signs are *lak* for text A’s *la-ak* in line A5 // C5 and *-kab-ba-* for text A’s *-ka-ba-* in line A51 // C17. By my reckoning, the LAG-sign is found only once in a Conventional document (*AuOr* 5 15:23) and the GAB-sign never. For the general contrast of CV vs CVC as a diagnostic feature in Conventional vs. Free Format tablets, see Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 85-88.

⁹ Other ritual texts that exist in multiple copies are Emar 369, the NIN.DINGIR festival, and Emar 385-388, the *kissu* festivals. Emar 369 is known from four copies. Daniel Fleming identified five in *The Installation of Baal’s High Priestess at Emar* (HSS 42; Atlanta: Scholar’s Press, 1992), 9, though Sallaberger has convincingly suggested that Emar 369 B and C are two parts of a single tablet; cf. Sallaberger, review of Daniel Fleming, *The Installation of Baal’s High Priestess at Emar*, *ZA* 86 (1996): 140-147. The *kissu* festival texts exist in a number of copies—Arnaud catalogues fourteen—though they do not all take the same form. Some tablets contain collections of several of these *kissu* rituals, while others may contain a copy of only a single *kissu*.

in terms of the legal genre, Conventional and Free Format texts simply served different populations.

The scribal formats have an important impact on dating the copies of the *zukru* ritual. The dates do not follow directly from the format, since the Conventional and Free Format styles actually overlapped for more than a generation.¹⁰ But historical considerations about the use of format help to define the chronology. The texts belonged to the collection managed by the Zū-Ba‘la family of Diviners, who are responsible for the production of the mass of ritual texts we now have.¹¹ But the Diviners only produced texts in the Free Format: administrative texts bearing their seals, scholarly texts signed with their colophons, and, indeed, any texts mentioning their names are all Free Format. And, as has already been noted, individuals did not cross between scribal formats. Therefore, the chronological significance of Emar 375A+’s Conventional format is that it must derive from a time prior to the installation of the Zū-Ba‘la family in the office of Diviner, which is to say no later than the first quarter of the 13th century. The three Free Format manuscripts of Emar 375+ have a *terminus a quo* of around 1275, the onset of Free Format scribalism in Emar, thus making them later copies of Manuscript A.

The relative antiquity of Emar 375+ (as compared with Emar 373+) is underscored by the calendar of the composition. Its designation of month I as Zarātu in Emar 375+ conforms to neither the Free Format nor the Conventional documents of the 13th century but rather to the calendar used in Conventional documents of the first royal

¹⁰ Based on scribal format alone, Emar 375A, the sole Conventional *zukru* manuscript would have a possible date ranging from the mid 14th century to the second quarter of the 13th.

¹¹ Daniel Fleming explores this aspect of the Diviners’ administrative activity in, “Emar’s *entu* Installation: Revising Ritual and Text Together” in *Texts and Contexts: The Circulation and Transmission of Cuneiform Texts in Social Space* (eds. Paul Delnero and Jacob Lauinger; Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 9; Boston: De Gruyter, 2015).

house of Emar, which is mostly attested prior to the Hittite conquest in the 14th century.¹² Emar 373+, on the other hand, uses the expected Free Format calendar, which is in common with the calendar used elsewhere in North Syria in the Hittite period.¹³ Since the Conventional Format manuscript of Emar 375+ was retained in the M_I archive even after newer copies were made, we might view it as an archived exemplar, inherited from an earlier period, from which the copies in the Free Format system were made.

In addition to Arnaud's text, which was subsequently expanded by Fleming, there are some new potential additions to Emar 375+. Rutz has suggested including the fragment edited as Emar 401 (Msk 74286c) with Emar 375A, joining to the middle of the tablet in lines 11-14. His grounds for inclusion are the correspondence of the content of Emar 401:3 with the expected restoration of 375A:13 and what he believes to be the Conventional Format style of 401, which limits the possible adjoining texts to 375A, 446, and 447, the latter two of which contain no comparable content.¹⁴ While I believe Rutz is correct to include Emar 401 in the Emar 375 complex, it seems that his placement of the fragment is mistaken.¹⁵ The physical layout of the fragment, to the extent that the line-drawing can be considered an accurate representation, does not support adjoining to the main tablet. Emar 401:2 would need to abut directly to the preserved tablet of Emar 375A at line 12. Emar 401:3 requires the restoration of one and a half signs prior to abutting the

¹² Cf. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 113, 198

¹³ As Daniel Fleming has now observed, that calendar could be specifically derived from or at least supported by Karkamiš, itself, making it a Karkamiš-centered feature of the expanded *zukru* (Daniel Fleming, forthcoming).

¹⁴ Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 149, 356.

¹⁵ Fleming already recognized that Emar 401 is "related to" Emar 375 by virtue of its resemblance to 375A:53. He did not, however, suggest any means of including the fragment in the main text. *Time at Emar*, 98 n.216, 99.

main tablet at line 13. Yet the physical edge of Emar 401 at line 3 extends farther to the right than at line 2, making it impossible for both lines to match up to the main tablet.¹⁶

Most importantly, I consider Rutz's classification of Emar 401 as Conventional to be unlikely. The fragment contains no diagnostic signs by which to categorize it paleographically and too little remains to make any assertions about its physical layout. Disposing of this classificatory limitation allows the fragment's more probable location to emerge. Only once is the verb *irrub* (Emar 401:2) employed in the Emar 375 complex: 375A:53 // 375C:19.¹⁷ It therefore seems likely that Emar 401 belongs to the corresponding line in either Manuscript B or Manuscript D, both of which now exist as mere fragments. Emar 401:3 would then suggest a restoration for Emar 375A:54 or 55, but since it is impossible to know the length of lines in these small fragments, an exact placement of the additional clause cannot be proposed.

Rutz's identification of an (unedited) text fragment, Msk 74177f, as "a possible fragment of one of the [shorter] *zukru* ritual texts" deserves some consideration.¹⁸ The text was excavated from M_I M III NE, apparently the southeast side of Locus 1, the main room of the M_I Building. It would accompany only a single other Emar 375+ fragment found in that excavation unit (Emar 397, see below) and only two found outside of Locus 3, the southern chamber of M_I.¹⁹ My reading of the text follows:

¹⁶ This might be reconsidered if additional signs stood between Emar 401:2 and 375A:12, extending the length of the space between them and thereby accommodating the additional space need for the following line. However, since the fragment preserves a clause-ending verb and the main tablet resumes with the distinguishing conjunction *ù*, it is unlikely that any further signs could intervene. If the verb of Emar 401:2 should be plural rather than singular, a possible *Ú* could stand in between. But comparison with Emar 375A:53 suggests singularity.

¹⁷ Most of the material following that line in both copies is broken, so it is impossible to compare the remainder of Emar 401 to those texts.

¹⁸ Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 148.

¹⁹ Emar 375B was also found in Locus 1, in the excavation unit M_I M III SE, the southeast corner of the main room.

1. ...] ʾ3ʿ(?) SILA₄ [...
 2. ...u]₄-mi 20 [+ n ...²⁰
 3. ...]-tu ú x [...
 4. ...] zu-uk-[rV...
 5. ... m]a(?) a-na [...
 6. ...] x x [...

1. ...] Three(?) lambs [...
 2. ...] the (22nd or 23rd) [d]ay [...
 3. ...] ... [...
 4. ...] zuk[ru ...
 5. ...] to [...
 6. ...] ... [...

The sequence ZU-UG occurs almost exclusively for the word *zukru*, which, in turn, is only employed in the *zukru* texts²¹ and the date formula corresponds to what is attested in the Emar 375+ complex (as opposed to that of Emar 373+).²² But, if the line-drawing's representation of the partially abraded wedges following "20" in line 2 is accurate then *n* can only be "2" or "3," yielding a date of the 22nd or 23rd. Neither date is named in any *zukru* text or in any other Emar ritual text. That fact, along with a general lack of context due to the small size of the fragment, preclude suggestions for placement in a known *zukru* text, if it should be so placed at all.

In addition to those fragments previously joined, I suggest that the fragment published as Emar 397 (Msk 74193d) should be included in Emar 375+, as well, based on the phrase "*bi-ri-it* ^{na4}*s[i-ka-na-ti]*," which occurs with this particular orthography only in the 375+ complex. Emar 397:4 matches Emar 375A53 // C19. The fragment preserves the end of the composition with the text wrapping around the bottom edge of the tablet. It is possible that the fragment joins directly with Emar 401, the second line of which picks up precisely where 397:4 leaves off. However, the physical form of Emar 401 as indicated

²⁰ If Arnaud's drawing of the partially abraded wedges following "20," is accurate then $1 < n < 4$. That yields a date of the 22nd or 23rd, neither of which is ever named for a ritual performance in any Emar ritual text.

²¹ The sole exception of which I am aware occurs in AuOrS1 95:15, *zu-uk-ki-ma*.

²² Rutz categorizes the fragment as Free Format (*Bodies of Knowledge*, 367, 480), which would exclude only Emar 375A from consideration. The classification apparently rests on the UG-sign in line 4. This form certainly differs from that of, e.g. Emar 375A:1, 17, and resembles more closely that of 373:42, 74, 169. However, the variability of Free Format style UG forms allows them to approach the Conventional form in many cases. Compare, e.g., UG in the Conventional text Emar 46:6 with that found in the Free Format text RA 77 5:17. Therefore, classification based on this sign, alone, is tenuous.

by the drawing makes no indication that it shares the tablet edge that is indicated for 397 and too little of the remaining text is preserved to assess the correspondence of the fragments. The most that can be said about Emar 397 is that it certainly belongs to the Emar 375+ complex and that it has a parallel in A53, which implies that, like Emar 401, it should belong to Manuscript B or Manuscript D. Any further conclusions could only be ascertained by collation.

Text of Emar 375+²³

Obverse

1. A [*tup-pu/i pár-ši ša zu*]-uk-ri i-nu-ma URU E-mar^{ki}
1. B [... š]a zu-uk-[ri ...]
1. C [...] URU E-mar

2. A [(4 signs) zu-uk-r]a i-na ^dDa-gan i-na-di-nu
2. B [...] i-na-an-di-nu
2. C [... i-n]a-an-di-nu

3. A [i-na ITI Za-ra-ti i-na U]D.15 SILA₄ i-na ^dDa-gan ^ri¹-pa-a-du
- 2-3. B [...] / [...] ^ri¹-pa-a-du
- 2-3. C i-na ITI Za-ra-ti / [...]

4. A [i-na u₄-mi 15 ^dĤAR-ar i-n]a u₄-mi šu-wa-ti-ma [^dDa-gan] ú-ši pa-nu-šu pe¹-tu-ú
- 3-4. B ^ri-na¹ [...] / [... ú]-ši pa-nu-šu pe-tu-[ú]
- 3-4. C i-na u₄-mi 15 ^dĤAR-ar / [... pa-nu-šu] ^rpe¹-tu-ú

5. A [^dha-ši(-in)-nu ša DINGIR(?) EG]IR-šu i-la-ak 2 UDU^[hi.a] i-na ŠÀ-šu-nu
- 4-5. B [...] / [... 2 UDU^{[hi.]ra1} i-na ŠÀ-šu-nu
5. C [... i]l-lak 2 UDU^{rhi.a1} <i-na> ^rŠÀ¹-[šu-nu]

6. A [1-en UDU(?) it-ti(?) ^dha-š]i-in-ni ša DINGIR¹ i-na [bi-ri-it^{na4}]sí-ka-na-ti
- 5-6. B 1-en U[DU[?] ...] / [... ^{na4}]sí-ka-na-ti
- 6-7. C [... ^dha-ši]-in-ni [ša DINGIR] / [...]

²³ Note that Text C comprises two, un-joined fragments. Arnaud identified the obverse of Msk 74303f (C¹) as one of three copies of Emar 375, but since the text of the reverse does not overlap that of copies A and B, he published it separately as Emar 449. The other fragment, Msk 74303c (C²), is one of Arnaud's three exemplars of Emar 448, with only one side preserved. Fleming recognized that these two copies belonged together not only based on content, but also because the paleography and physical features of the tablets are identical (*Time at Emar*, 258). The obverse text of Text C is found only on C¹. For the reverse, lines 8-13 are found on C² only; lines 14-19 are formed by C² + C¹; and lines 20-22 are on C¹ only.

7. A [ú-ši(?) (7 signs)]^ri¹-na bi-ri-it^{na4}s[i-ka-na-ti] ú-ši
6-7. B [...] / [...] ú-ši
7. C [...] x [...]
8. A [i-na u₄-mi šu-wa-ti(-ma)(?) i-na] bi-ri-it^{na4}sí-k[a-na-ti (0-3 signs)] vacat
7. B i-na u₄-m[i ...]
9. A [(5 signs) ù-qá(?)]-da-šu i-na u₄-mi šu-[wa-ti-ma] vacat
8. B [...] x ù-qá-da-šu [...]
10. A [(9 signs)] GUD^{hi.a} šu¹-me-e ú-la[-lu(?) 4 signs^d]Da-gan
9. B [...]^rGUD^{hi.a} ú-[la(?)]-^ral²-lu²¹ [...]
- A i-li-ia pa-na-šu-u ú-ka-ta-mu
B [...]
11. A [(9 signs)]^rd¹NIN.KUR.RA a-n[a (6 signs)] DINGIR^{hi.a} i-pa-a-du
12. A [(9 signs)]-du i-n[a (7 signs)] ù^dha-ši-nu ša DINGIR
13. A [(9 signs)] a-na bi-[ri-it^{na4}sí-ka-na]-ti ú-ša-at¹-bu
14. A [(9 signs)]i²a-na^d [(7 signs)]^{na4}sí-ka-na-ti ÚŠ^{hi.a} Ì.GIŠ ú-pa-ša-šu
15. A [(7 signs) i-na-a]š²-šu-ú(?)^u[^{ru}E-mar^{ki}(?) i]-^rka¹-[lu] i-ša-tu
16. A [(10 signs)] x UDU [3 signs^{na4}s]í-ka-ni ša^dNIN.URTA
17. A [(12 signs)] a [3.5 signs^dDa]-gan re-eš zu-uk-ri
18. A [(12 signs)]n[a ma x x x x šum-ma SILA₄^{hi.a}
19. A [(13 signs)]^rx¹e-sà-am-me a-na É^dDa-gan ú-pa-ḫa-ru
20. A [(15 signs)]i-la-kám-ma
21. A [(14 signs)]DINGIR^{meš} ù É^{hi.a} Ì^{meš!} i-ba-a-tù
22. A [(14 signs)]-e-nu-tu ù^dha-ši-nu ša^dKASKAL
0-1. D [...] / ^rù¹^dha-ši-in-[nu ...]
23. A [(14 signs)] 1 UDU 1 AMAR a-na pa-ni^{na4}sí-ka-ni
1-2. D [...] / [1 U]DU 1 AMAR a-na p[a-ni ...]

24. A [ša^dNIN.URTA(?) (14 signs)] *a-na bi-ri-it*^{na4}*sí-k[a-n]a-tì*
2-3. D [...] / ^{na4}*ḥa-ar-ši*

25. A [(14 signs)] *i-na ŠÀ-šu¹ 2 ma-ka-a[l-t]i[?]*
3. D *a-[...]*

26. A [*i-na ŠÀ-šu(?)* (10 signs)] *i-na ŠÀ-šu i-na-du-ma*
4. D *ù*^{na4}*ḥa-ar-ši* [...]

Reverse

27. A [(6 signs)]-*tu*₄ GUD UDU^{hi.a} NINDA KAŠ [*a-na*] *pa-ni*^d*Da-gan* Ì.KÚ
4-5. D [...] / *a-na pa-ni*^d*Da-g[an ...]*

28. A [(6 signs)] *sí-ka-na-tì i-na* [*u*₄]-*mi 7 ki-ma* *u*₄-¹*mi*¹ [*ma-ḥi-ri-ma*]
5. D [...]

29. A [(4 signs) ^d*Da-ga*] *n ù DINGIR*^{hi.a} *ù*^d*Ḥa-ši-in-nu ša DINGIR* [0-3 signs]
5-6. D [...] / ^d*Da-gan ù DINGIR*^{m[ēš]} ...]

30. A [(6 signs)] *ú-ši-ú i-ka-lu i-ša-at-tu i-na* ¹*u*₄-*mi*¹
6-7. D [...] / *i-na u*₄-*mi*

31. A [*šu-wa-ti-ma i-na pa-n*] *i(?) li-le-e-tì* ¹*É*^{hi.a} *tù-ur-tu*₄ <<erasure>>
7. D *šu-wa-tù* [...]

32. A [(3 signs) *lu-bu-uš*]-*ma ù ka-lu-ma i-s[à]*[?]*-am-me GEŠTIN ú-pa-ḥa-ar-ma*
7-8. D [...] / *lu*₄-*bu-uš-ma ù* [...]

33. A [(6 signs) *q*] *a-du ma-ka-li-šu-nu ù UDU SILA*₄ *ša URU.KI*
8-9. D [...] / *q*₄-*a-du ma-ka-li-š[u-nu ...]*

34. A [(6 signs)] *x i-na ŠÀ-bi tù-ur-tì i-sà-al¹-lu-sú*
9-10. D [...] / *i-sà-lu*₄-*sú*

35. A [(6 signs)] ¹*u*₄-*ša-ak-ka-lu-šu DUMU*^{meš} *ù GAL*^{hi.a} *ša URU.KI*
10. D *ù* [...]

36. A [*i-na u*₄-*mi šu-wa-ti*]-*ma ú-ši ù ki-ir-ba-ni-šu-nu ú-pa-as-sà-sú¹*
11. D *i-na u*₄-*mi šu-wa-ti-[ma ...]*

37. A [(6 signs) *a-n*] *a ša-ḥa-tì U[DU] ša Ù.TU qà-di-iš*
11-12. D [...] / [(1 sign)] ¹*x* *ša-ni* [...]

38. A [(7 signs)] UDU *ša Ù.TU e-li-il*
12-13. D [...] / [(2 signs) *š*] *a* ¹*ù*¹.TU ...]

39. A [(6 signs)] x x *qa-ri i-qa¹-du-ši-i*
8. C [...] ^hš^{i?} x
40. A [(10 signs)] UDU ù *ku-ba-di₁₂* <<erasure>>
8-9. C [...] / [... *ku-b*]*a-di₁₂*
41. A [*a-na pa-ni* (5 signs) ^hi.a GAL *ku-ba-di ù-ka-ba-du* <<erasure>>
9-10. C *a-na pa-n*[*i* ...] / [...]
42. A [(6 signs) ^{uzu}*ka-bar-t*]*a i-ša¹-ap-pa-ru*
10. C [...] x x *ta^{uzu}ka-b*[*ar-ta* ...]
43. A [(6 signs) *a-na* É] ^d*Da-gan ú-pá-ḥa-ru*
10-11. C [...] / [... *a-na*] É ^d*Da-gan ú-pá-ḥa-ru*
44. A [(8 signs)] ^hú¹-*ba-lu-šu-nu-ti*
11. C [...]
45. A [(9 signs)] ^hi¹-*na u₄-mi*
12. C ^hi¹-*na* ITI.KÁM ^dEN *bi-ta-ri* ^hi¹-[*na* ...]
46. A [(6 signs)]-ú[?] *ša-ar-ba-a-tu i-ḥa-tá-ka* KI^{er-še-tu⁴} *ú-ul i*-[...]
12-13. C [...] / *ša-ar-ba-a-tu₄ i-ḥa-tá-ka* K[I.^{er-še-tu⁴} ...]
47. A [^dEN *Ḥa-la-ab i-n*]*a u₄-mi* 16 ^{giš}ŠINIG[?] *ša-ar-ba-a-tu₄ i-ša-mi-du-ú* [...]
14. C ^dEN *Ḥa-la-ab i-na u₄-mi* 16 ^{giš}ŠINIG(?) *ša-ar-ba-a-tu₄* ^hi-*ša¹*-[*mi-du-ú* ...]
48. A [*e-ri-šu* KI^{er-še-tu⁴}] x UDU *ú-ši-x* [0-3 signs] vacat
15. C *e-ri-šu* KI^{er-še-tu⁴} ù *la* [(3 signs) L]^hú¹-*lam* UDU ^hú¹-[*ši*]-x
49. A [(10 signs)] ù *ti-l*[*a-šu* GUD^{hi.a}] UDU.U₈^{hi.a}
15-16. C [...] / ^hú¹ *ti-la-šu* GUD^{hi.a} UDU^{hi.a}
50. A [*a-na* É (5 signs) ZI]^{na-pi-i}^{š-ta}-*šu ú-ta*]-*ru*
16-17. *a-na* ^hÉ¹ [(5 signs)] ZI^{na-pi-iš-ta}-*šu* / ^hú¹-*ta-ru*
51. A [ù *bi-ri-it* ^{na⁴}*sí-ka-na-tì* ...] ù KÁ.GAL^{hi.a} [*ku*]-^hba-*di₁₂*(?)¹ [*ú*]-^hka-*ba¹*]-[*du*(?)]
17. C ù *bi-ri-it* ^{na⁴}*sí-k*[*a-na-tì* ...] KÁ.GAL^{hi.a} *ku-ba-di₁₂* *ú-kab-ba-dù*
391:1 [ù] *bi-ri-it* ^{na⁴}*s*[*i-ka-na-tì* ...]
52. A [ù LÚ^h-*lam* NA₄ IG ù ZAG.UDU (6 signs)] *ú-še-še ku-ba-di₁₂ bi-ri-it*
18-19. C ^hú[?] LÚ^h-*lam* NA₄ IG ù ZAG.UDU [...] *ú-še-še ku*]-*ba-di₁₂ bi-ri-it* /
397:2 [... *bi-ri*]-^hit¹
401:1 [... *ú-še*]-^hše[?]1[...]

A ^{na4}*sí-ka-ni*
C ^[na4]*ʾsí-ka-na-ti*^ʾ
397:2 ^[na4]*ʾsí-ka-na-ti*

53. A [*ú-ka-ba-du* (6 signs) ^{hi.a}*a-na*] É DINGIR-*lì i-ru-ub*
19. C ^[na4]*ʾú*^ʾ-*[kab-ba-dù ...]* ^{hi.a}*a-na* É DINGIR-*lì i-ru-ub*
397:4 [...] ^{hi.a}*a-na* ^[na4]*ʾÉ*^ʾ
401:2 [...] DINGIR-*lì i-ru-ub*

54. A [(14 signs)] KI MIN URU.KI *ú-ša-qí-lu*
20. C [...] ^[na4]*ʾú*^ʾ-*ša-qí-lu*
401:3 [... *bì*]-*ri-it* ^{na4}*sí-k*[*a-na-t i...*]

20. C *ku-ba-du*

21. C [...] GUD^{hi.a} *ù*
401:4 [...] x (x) x x [...]

22. C [...] ^[na4]*ʾx* ^{hi.a}

Translation of Emar 375+²⁴

Obverse

1. [Tablet of the rites] of the *zuku*. When the city of Emar
2. [...] gives [the *zuku*]*u* for Dagan,
3. in the month of Zarātu, [on the] 15th [day], they will restrain a lamb for Dagan.
4. On the 15th day, (the day of) Šaggar— on that same day [Dagan] will go out, his face unveiled.
5. [The god's axe(?)] will go behind him. Two sheep are among them.
6. One of the [sheep along with(?)] the god's axe between the *sikkānu*-stones
7. [will go out(?). ...] will go out between the *sikkānu*-stones.
8. On [that same(?)] day between the *sikkānu*-stones [...]
9. [...] they will consecrate. On that same day
10. [...] oxen, roasted (meats), they will pu[rify(?). ...] Dagan will go up. They will veil his face.
11. [...] ^dNIN.KUR to [...] the gods they will restrain.
12. [...] in [...] and the god's axe
13. [...] between the *sik[kānu]*-stones they will lift up.
14. [...] to [DN...] the *sikkānu*-stones they will anoint with blood and oil.
15. [...] They will [raise(?)]. [(The people of) Emar] will feast.
16. [...] sheep [...s]*ikkānu*-stone of NIN.URTA.

²⁴ This translation is a diplomatic edition, reading all four copies together and noting differences where necessary. Lineation follows that of Text A.

17. [...Da]gan, head of the *zuku*.
18. [...] if the lambs
19. [...] will be roasted. They will collect (it/them) for the temple of Dagan.
20. [...] (he/it) will come and
21. [...] (with?) the gods and the temples the oil will remain overnight.
22. [...] and the god's processional axe
23. [...] one sheep (and) one calf before the *sikkānu*-stone
24. [of ^dNIN.URTA(?) ...] between the *sikkānu*-stones²⁵
25. [...] therein, two bowls
26. [therein ... and the *sikkānu*-stones²⁶] therein they will place and

Reverse

27. [...] ox, sheep, bread, (and) beer before Dagan they will eat.
28. [...] the *sikkānu*-stones on the seventh day just as (on) the [previous] day
29. [...] Dagan and the gods and the god's axe [...]
30. [...] will go out. They will feast. On that same day
31. [before] night(fall) the return (ceremony) [will ...] the temples.
32. [...] is clothed and everything will be roasted. He will collect the wine and
33. [...] along with their food offerings and the sheep (and) lamb from the city
34. [...] during the return for a third time they will
35. [...] they will rub it. Townsmen and Chiefs of the city
36. [...] On that same day he will go out and they will smash their clods.
37. [...] f]or the cleansing(?). The breeding [ram] is clean.
38. [...] the breeding ram is pure.
39. [...] they will set it (fem.) afire.
40. [...] sheep and the Glorification ceremonies
41. before [...] great [...] they will perform the Glorification ceremonies
42. [...] the shank] they will send.
43. [...] for] the temple of Dagan they will collect.
44. [...] they will carry them.
45. In the (same) month: The Lord of *bitaru*. On [the *n*th] day
46. [...] will cut the poplar. [They] will not [...] the land.
47. [...] the Lord of Aleppo. O]n the 16th day they will bind tamarisk²⁷ (and) poplar. [...]
48. the ones who plow the land and [...] man, sheep [...]
49. [...] and its harness, oxen, (and) ewes²⁷
50. to the house [...] his life (/livestock) they will restore.
51. And between the *sikkānu*-stones [...] and the city gates they will perform the Glorification ceremonies.
52. And the man, the stone of the door, and the mutton shoulder [...] he will bring out. The Glorification ceremonies between the *sikkānu*-stone(s)
53. [they will perform. ...] He will enter into the temple of the gods.

²⁵ Text D: "[between the] *ḥarṣu*-stones."

²⁶ The reading "and the *sikkānu*-stones" derives from text D, which reads "and the *ḥarṣu*-stones." Since text D is unique in calling the stones *ḥarṣu*, presumably the other exemplars would have read *sikkānu*, here.

²⁷ Text C: "the sheep."

54. [...] between the *sikkānu*-stones[...] the same (from) the city they paid. The
Glorification Ceremony [...]
55. [...] oxen and
56. [...]

Table 2. *Orthographic Variations among the Manuscripts of Emar 375+*

Line (A)	Text A	Text B	Text C	Text D
1	<i>E-mar</i> ^{k1}		<i>E-mar</i>	
2	<i>i-na-di-nu</i>	<i>i-na-an-di-nu</i>	[<i>i-n</i>] <i>a-an-di-nu</i>	
5	<i>i-la-ak</i>		[<i>i</i>] <i>l-lak</i>	
22	<i>ḥa-ṣi-nu</i>			<i>ḥa-ṣi-in-[nu]</i>
24	^{na4} <i>sí-k[a-n]a-tì</i>			^{na4} <i>ḥa-ar-ṣi</i>
29	DINGIR ^{h1.a}			DINGIR ^m [^{es}]
34	<i>i-sà-al^l-lu-sú</i>			<i>i-sà-lu₄-sú</i>
49	UDU.U ₈ ^{h1.a}		UDU ^{h1.a}	
51	[<i>ú</i>]- ^r <i>ka-ba¹-[du]</i>		<i>ú-kab-ba-dù</i>	
52	^{na4} <i>sí-ka-ni</i>		[^{na4}] ^r <i>sí-ka-na-tì¹</i>	

Text A: Textual and Philological Notes

A1. The entire left edge of the tablet is broken away, making it difficult to estimate the length of the line-initial lacunae, throughout. One must rely on instances where known context or stock phrases span multiple lines, thereby allowing reasonable conjectures for restorations. But even the best conjectures sometimes yield dubious results. Despite the fact that the same amount of space should be missing from the beginning of each of the first 14 lines, Arnaud reconstructs anywhere between four and eleven signs per line; Fleming between three and nine. There may be cause to inject fewer signs into the first line than the rest, as a precedent exists for the incipit phrase of a ritual text taking up as

much as fifty percent more space than the proceeding lines.²⁸ But otherwise, some consistency in line length should be sought in restorations. Line 3, whose restoration is almost entirely confirmed by preserved text in exemplar C, necessitates the space of some nine signs. This number should serve as a baseline for the remainder of lines 2-14.

The mention of the festival name in the initial line indicates the presence of a common formula found in Emar ritual texts: “Tablet of the rites of (Festival Name).” The exact form can be subject to some variation (see Table 3).²⁹ The formula is preserved most fully in Text B, “[...] *ša zu-uk-[ri]*.”³⁰

Table 3. *Incipit Formulae for Rituals*

Emar 369A:1	<i>tup-pu pá-r-ši</i> NIN.DINGIR ^d IŠKUR
Emar 369C:1	[....] <i>ša</i> NIN.DINGIR <i>ša</i> ^d IŠKUR
Emar 385A:1	<i>tup-pí pá-r-ši</i> ^{ez} [^{en} <i>ki-is</i>]- <i>sí</i> <i>ša</i> ^{uru} <i>Ša-tap-pí</i>
Emar 385D:1 ³¹	[<i>tup-pí pá-r</i>]- <i>ši</i> ^{ezen} <i>ki-is-sí</i> <i>ša</i> ^{uru} <i>Ša-tap-pí</i>
Emar 392:1	[<i>tup</i>]- <i>pu</i> GARZA <i>ša i-mi-iš-ti</i> <i>ša</i> LUGAL KUR <i>ša</i> ^{uru} [...]
Emar 393:1	[...] <i>ša</i> ^d <i>Ar-ú-ri</i> ”
Emar 446:1	[...] <i>pár-š</i>] <i>i</i> <i>ša</i> URU.KI
Emar 460:1	DUB <i>an-nu-ú</i> <i>ša</i> <i>ši-ra-ḫi</i> ^d INANNA MÈ

²⁸ See Emar 369A:1. Other texts with similar formulae are written in a space consistent with the remainder of the tablet (e.g. Emar 392:1; 460:1).

²⁹ Cf. Arnaud’s “[*tup-pí ezen zu*]-*uk-ri*” and Fleming’s “[*pár-šu(?)* *ša zu*]-*uk-ri*”, neither of which occur as such among the attested formulae.

³⁰ Arnaud describes Text B as having “une leçon embarrassante,” assuming that EZEN must stand in the break prior to *ša* (Emar VI.3, 370), but *zuku* is never determined with EZEN in this text.

³¹ The formula is notably absent at the head of another *kissu* text, Emar 388 (exemplar K in Arnaud’s text-list enumerated under the heading “Emar 385”). That text opens: *i-na u₄-mi* *ša qa-du-ši* *ša* EZEN^{mes} *ki-is-sí* (...). The discrepancy is likely related to the fact that this tablet, unlike other compendious copies of the *kissu* festivals, only contains instructions for the single *kissu* for ^dNIN.KUR. The same can be said of Emar 387, exemplar J, which recounts the event that Arnaud dubs “Rituel...d’Išhara et de Ninurta,” though this copy lacks reference to both deities in favor of ḫḫ, alone. The introductory line reads: [*u₄-m*] *i* *qa-du-ši* *ša* ^{ezen}LA 1 ^{ninda}*hu-uk-ku* / (...). Arnaud mistakenly reproduced this text in a footnote as “[*i-na u₄-m*] *i* *qa-du-ši* LA 1 *hu-uk-ku*”, labeling the line as “incompréhensible” (Emar VI.3, 386). But rather this “festival of abundance” (^{ezen}LA) is probably just an alternate reference to the *kissu* complex (cf. Fleming, *Installation*, 259).

Based on comparison with *enūma* clauses elsewhere in the ritual texts, the phrase “*inūma...inaddinu*” (lines 1-2) should be a single, complete sentence.³² However, the approximately nine-character length of the initial lacuna demands a longer restoration than the ritual’s name, alone.³³ Any further restoration would be speculative, but it is worth considering that, were the shorter *zukru* a septennial celebration like its longer counterpart, this lacuna would likely contain the specification of that cycle.³⁴ Such is the case in Emar 373:169-70, which interjects the temporal clause, *i-na* MU.7.KÁM^{mes} (“upon each seventh year”) into the “when the Emarites...” formula.

The use of the preposition *ina* rather than *ana* may serve to indicate a dative of advantage, “for (the benefit of) Dagan,” as translated here. Such is the use of *ina* in the ritual texts Emar 446:48-50 and 452:30.³⁵ It is also possible that the construction should simply indicate that the *zukru* is given “to” the deity.³⁶

That “giving” (*nadānu*) the *zukru* event was the standard idiom³⁷ is made clear by Emar 373:169-70, as well as in the Mari letter A. 1121 + 2731, the only mention of the *zukru(m)* outside of Emar.³⁸ Unlike other *enūma* clauses whose subjects are “the people of Emar” (369A:1; 373:169; 385:2), here the singular subject “Emar” results in a marked subjunctive verb *inaddinu* (Text B, C: *inandinu*).³⁹

³²Cf. Emar 369A:1-2; Emar 373:169-70; Emar 385:2. For full text of these lines, see Table 7, page 161.

³³ So Fleming’s 2.5 sign restoration “[*zu-uk-r*]a” and Arnaud’s 4 sign “[*ezen zu-uk-ra*], followed by MEDA.”

³⁴ For a consideration of the interval between performances of the shorter *zukru* ritual, see page 100.

³⁵ Cf. Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 458.

³⁶ For *ina* best translated as “to,” cf. Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 458. Seminara reckons the present case as this type of usage.

³⁷ Cf. Emar 385:2; 392:2, where ritual events are “performed” (*epēšu*). In fact, the *zukru* festival can also be “performed,” as is indicated by 373:38.

³⁸ See Bertrand Lafont, “Le roi de Mari et les prophètes du dieu Adad,” *RA* 78 (1984): 9, lines 3, 6 (*zukrim ana Addu nadānim*) and line 10 (*zukram nadānam*).

³⁹ So Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 399. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 266 suggests that the subject is treated as plural, considering the other texts which specify the people of the city rather than the city, itself. But, since the problem can be resolved through the standard grammar, I prefer such an explanation here. The

A3. As an alternative to reading the numeral 15 as a date designation, it is possible to interpret the line as prescribing the enclosure of fifteen lambs.⁴⁰ That interpretation would provide a determined number for SILA₄, whose quantity is otherwise left unspecified, and would alleviate the awkwardness of giving the date both here and in the very next line (seen in Text C).⁴¹ However, in favor of a date formula, cf. Emar 446:59-60, one of only two other Conventional Format ritual texts: ITI ^dNIN.KUR.RA *i-na* UD.17 SILA₄ *i-na* ^dNIN.KUR / *i-pa-a-du*. As this example necessitates, the unspecified quantity of SILA₄ must imply a single unit.⁴² Note also that in Emar 375, as with Emar 446, KÁM is never employed in date formulae, so its absence here is no deterrence.

A4. The restoration of the beginning of the line is based on text C. Despite the occurrence of UD by itself in the previous line, further on in this line and indeed throughout the rest of this text, the word is always written syllabically as *u₄-mi* (or UD with complement *-mi*, depending on how one prefers to read it).

Fleming restored only HAR for text A, based on such a short writing in Emar 446:45, which shares text's A's scribal format.⁴³ But the writing with a phonetic

text does go on to use third person singular verbs to express action, but this is the usual, impersonal third person used for ritual prescriptions throughout the corpus. For an example of the expected subjunctive marking on an unequivocally singular verb, cf. Emar 392:2, *enūma imišta eppušuma*, whose singular nature is made clear by *illakma* in line 4. For Text B and C's lack of assimilation -nd- < -dd- (or dissimilation, as the case may be), see Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 225.

⁴⁰ So Arnaud, Emar VI.3, 368, though he misreads "15" as "4." See Fleming's collation note (*Time at Emar*, 300). Fleming's drawing of the preceding sign is hardly definitive for UD, though that reading is valid for the traces.

⁴¹ Note, however, the plural groups of animals in this text are always otherwise marked with HI.A.

⁴² Emar 375 never again calls for a single unit of any offering material, so there is no comparative data available to assess whether this case is an oddity or represents the standard practice of its author for denoting singularity. Emar 446, however, does employ the numeral 1 in some cases; see 446:46, 48, 79, et al.

⁴³ Daniel Fleming (personal communication).

complement (ḤAR-*ar*) appears in text C, which introduces orthographic variations to text A's readings sparingly, despite its different writing convention.⁴⁴ For this reason, as well as in consideration of the necessary length of the broken text, I furnish the longer writing, ḤAR-*ar*.

Here and in line 10 it becomes clear that a rite of veiling Dagan's face was practiced in the shorter *zukru* ritual as will be seen also in the longer festival version. Because the context for the rite here is minimal and because its purpose only becomes clear from the more fully preserved perspective of the longer *zukru* text, discussion of this rite is deferred to the next chapter.

A6. Grammatically, the *-i* ending on *ḥaššinni* demands that the form be either (1) the *nomen rectum* of a construct phrase, (2) the direct object of a verb in pl. obl., or (3) the object of a preceding preposition. Since the first two are forms not attested for this word elsewhere in the Emar corpus, I follow the third, which has a precedent in Emar 369A:33: NIN.DINGIR *it-ti* ^{giš}TUKUL DINGIR^{meš} *ù* ^{lú}*za-ma-ri i-^lla^l*-[*ak(?)*], “With the divine weapon, the NIN.DINGIR and the singers will go.”⁴⁵ This example demonstrates the possibility that the weapon can be assigned to accompany a particular player, perhaps especially when a verb of motion is employed.⁴⁶

Arnaud's ten-sign reconstruction for the medial lacuna far overestimates the available space.

⁴⁴ There are seven differences in the C text as compared to A, four of which are simply homophonic sign choices or CV vs CVC values. In no case does C vary from A in a matter of phonetic complements.

⁴⁵ The restoration follows Fleming, *Installation*, 17.

⁴⁶ Note that text B of Emar 369 diverges significantly from A in this section. In B, the NIN.DINGIR is said specifically to carry (*našû*) the weapon.

A9. For the reading [*ù-qá*]-*da-šu*, see Text B, Note 8 (page 54). I have restored the signs based on text B, though it is uncertain whether the orthographic oddities of that text's reading (with *Ù* as a verbal prefix) would be present here also.

A10. For *šummê* (D-stem plural oblique verbal adjective, *šawû*), note intervocalic *ww* > *mm* occurs without exception at Emar, even as intervocalic *w* > *m* occurs inconsistently.⁴⁷ Note also the final *-e* vowel instead of expected *-i*: *šummu* + *ī* > *šummî* > *šummê*.⁴⁸

Where I have restored a D-stem verb *ulla*[*lū*], Arnaud and Fleming read *ula* independently as a particle of negation. This particle, known in the dialects of Old Babylonian and OB Mari, is never attested elsewhere in Emar Akkadian. Seminara connects it to a variant form, *ulu*, itself known only once at Emar,⁴⁹ which may be related to the same lemma attested sparingly in western peripheral Akkadian.⁵⁰ It is equally likely that “*ù-la*[...]” belongs to the verb that must stand in the break to complete the clause. The reading of *ullalū*⁵¹ places this line in dialogue with Emar 373:176 where oxen and sheep are purified (GUD^{meš} UDU^{hi.a} *gabbi ullulū*), also on the 15th day of the first month.⁵² Taken together, these indicate that the purification of livestock was a crucial part of *zukru* observance.

⁴⁷ See Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 162-64. Note *šuwāti* in line 4 of this text, where *w* is conserved.

⁴⁸ For attestations of variation between *i* and *e* in Emar Akkadian, especially in case-endings, see Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 119-20.

⁴⁹ Emar 29:17', of “Syro-Hittite” type: *u-lu dumu-ru-ni* “you are not our son.” Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 518.

⁵⁰ EA 357: 4, 45 (literary); RS 20.162:6-16 (epistolary).

⁵¹ For the D-stem of *elēlu* with *šumû* “roasted meat” as object, see BBR 1-20:164. Daniel Fleming alerted me to this reference and the possibility that *elēlu* is the best option for a verbal reconstruction here (personal communication).

⁵² In that case, the rite takes place in the sixth year of the septennial celebration.

The simplest interpretation of *i-li-ia* is /illiya/, 3 m.s. pres. of *elû* with the ventive suffix. Since normally *i + a > â* in Emar Akkadian, this case would represent a rare preservation of the III-weak consonant.⁵³ Such a phenomenon is attested twice for this verb, in particular, in Emar texts: AuOrS 1 82:23 (*i-li-ia*) and *Iraq* 54 2:9 (*i-li-ia-am*)—both Conventional Format documents.⁵⁴ Fleming’s adverbial interpretation, “above” (*iliya* = *eliya*), is difficult to understand in context, even if it is formally possible.⁵⁵

A13. A preposition with a following BI-sign only ever occurs in the Emar 375+ group for the phrase *ina/ana birit*—a phrase which is only ever followed by the word *sikkānāti* (or once *sikkānī*, 375A:52). It is for this reason that I adopt the reading “*a-na bi-[ri-it^{na4} si-ka-na]-ti*” here, though I do so with caution. In no other instance in any copy of Emar 375+ is *sikkānāti* written with the TI-sign, rather than TÌ.⁵⁶ In fact, the orthography of the word (*si-ka-na-ti*) is otherwise entirely consistent in the 375+ exemplars.⁵⁷

⁵³ For *elû* + ventive > *illâ* see, e.g. Emar 7:11; 8:43. see Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 148.

⁵⁴ For the rare occurrences of non-contraction of adjacent vowels, in general, see Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 150. Emar 375A:30 shows non-contraction of III-weak final vowels with verbal suffixes to be habitual with the form *û-ši-û*.

⁵⁵ For the -*ya* ending, Fleming compares *ana dāriya* “forever” from one MB Alalah text (AT 15:8, 12, 23), and the phrase *elija ša šīšê* “horseman” in the Late Babylonian Darius inscription VAB 3 49 §42:75 (*Time at Emar*, 266). It is also possible to read “*Dagan iliya*” as a fixed title or manifestation of Dagan (“Dagan, my god”) though, in addition to being unattested elsewhere, this understanding is also ill-suited for the context.

⁵⁶ The problem is avoided if the reading *mu_x-na-bi-[a-tu/i]* is preferred. It would not complete the restoration of the lacuna and could not be the subject of the clause since the following verb, *uṣatbû*, is masculine. The term appears in Emar 373:107 in the long god-list, without any active role in the ritual. Because the presence of the *munabbiātu* is unknown elsewhere in Emar 375 and the context of this line in particular is not ascertainable, it would be incautious to suggest it here.

⁵⁷ Emar 373+, on the other hand, utilizes a different orthography for the same word (*si-ka-na-ti*), with which it is generally consistent, at least in terms of sign value. In one case the orthography varies (*si-ik-ka-na-ti*, line 174); in two cases the determinative lacks a marker of plurality (lines 22, 68); twice the term is reduced to a simple “NA₄^{meš}” (lines 34, 167); and once an entirely different word is used to describe the objects (“*na4 ha-ar-ši*”, line 22).

I follow Arnaud's emendation of the tablet's *ú-ša-ab-bu* to *ú-ša-at¹-bu* /*ušatbû*/, the Š-stem of *tebû*, "to arise"⁵⁸ based on correspondence with the same ritual action in Emar 369:60; 385:21.⁵⁹ Perhaps *tebû* signals an end to the day's activities in the same way that ritual materials are picked up (Emar 373:200) and returned to the city (Emar 373:79, 84-85, 194) in the longer *zukru* text. If *ú-ša-ab-bu* is to be retained, one might look to Akkadian *šapû* "to fasten," known in SB ritual and Akkadian ritual texts from Boghazkoy,⁶⁰ or Aramaic *šûp*, "to polish, smear over; rub, anoint."

A15. By a wide margin, most words whose orthography ends with a plene /-u/ are verbal forms.⁶¹ This suggests that the first two signs conclude a preceding clause; what follows stands alone. The conjectural restoration of *našû* follows the presence of that verb in the ritual texts Emar 369:2 (*i-na-aš-šu-ú*) and 388:33 (*i-na-šu-ú*). In line 13, the verb *tebû* is used to designate the action of "lifting." The two might be used to designate different ritual actions in the text, as they are in the NIN.DINGIR installation text.⁶²

The restoration ^u[^{ru}*E-mar*^{ki} (?) *i*]-^r*ka*¹-[*lu*]" follows Fleming's suggestion.⁶³ The city standing alone as the subject (with its population implied as actors) follows the example set by line 1. There is a high probability that the verb "drink" (*šatû*) should be

⁵⁸ CAD T s.v. *tebû* mng 11b "to make someone get up, said of statues of deities."

⁵⁹ In those cases the verb appears as *ú-še-et-bu-ú*. For the coexistence of *a* and *e* vocalizations of III-weak verbs, see Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 438, who explains it by either lack of phonemic distinction of *a* and *e* in the Emarite language or influence of more than one dialect of core Akkadian on the Akkadian of Emar.

⁶⁰ See references in CAD Š1 s.v. *šapû* B.

⁶¹ I know of five deviations from the norm in the ritual corpus: *pa-na-šu-u* (Emar 375A+:10), *ú-nu-tù-ú* (Emar 369:93), *eb-bu-ú* (Emar 387:4, 6; 388:7), *an-nu-ú* (Emar 460:1), and *qa-du-ú* (*idem* 18).

⁶² Cf. Emar 369:2 with 369:60.

⁶³ *Time at Emar*, 260.

accompanied here by “eat” (*akālu*), as it is in line 30 and, indeed, all its appearances in Emar ritual.⁶⁴

A19. This line, along with the near-parallel line 32, presents one of the most challenging readings in the text. I derive the odd form *esamme* from *šamû* (*šawû*) “become roasted,” which complements the occurrence of a nominal form of the same root, *šummê*, “roasted (meat)” in line 10.⁶⁵ The masc. sing. subject of this verb, the meaning of which is stative in the G-stem, is probably a sacrificial animal now lost in the line-initial break. The preparation of sacrificial meats with fire seems to be something of a staple in *zukru* practice: a similar procedure is also prescribed in Emar 373:37, 63 (*qalû*), which may, in fact, indicate a burnt offering.⁶⁶ “Burning (up)” is not attested in the semantic range of *šamû*, so if that action were intended here, it would be a novel use of the verb.

The realization of the initial sibilant as /s/ rather than /š/ is difficult to explain, though it is not the only such case in this text. Line 34 attests a form *isallusû*, which also uses ZA /sà/ in place of ŠA for the root *šalāšu*. Despite the liberal alternation between *i* and *e* vowels in Emar Akkadian, the prefixed *e-* of *esamme* is unexpected (though cf. the expected prefix form in line 32, *isamme*). The usual environments in which expected *i* > *e* occurs are in the prefixes of I-aleph verbs, genitival case-endings, and the vowel of enclitic *-mi*.⁶⁷ It seems in this case that the thematic vowel has been realized as *e* (*isammi*

⁶⁴ E.g. Emar 369:13 *et al.* (NAG); 370:33 *et al.* (NAG); 373:22, 34, 601, 173 (NAG); 422:8; 426:3

⁶⁵ This stands in contrast to Arnaud’s emendation to *e-ša-mi-<du>* (“on attelle”), which is followed by Fleming. For the latter, this reading has the benefit of reflecting a sequential pairing of *šamādu* and *pahāru* that also occurs in line 32, though I have rejected the reading of *šamādu* in that case, leaving no basis for comparison (see note A32).

⁶⁶ See page 221

⁶⁷ So Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 120, 132.

> *isamme*) and has effected a kind of (albeit non-standard) vowel harmony (*isamme* > *esamme*).

Arnaud and, following him, Fleming, read *e-ša-am-me-<du>*, based on a perceived correspondence with that verbal root in line 32. My rendering of line 32, however, does not sustain that reading. The only present form of the verb *šamādu* in the ritual corpus occurs in Emar 377:3. There, the verb takes on the expected vocalization, *išammadū*.

The D-stem of the root *paḥāru* is factitive; the implied object of the verb is either SILA₄ of line 18 or lost in the initial lacuna of line 19.⁶⁸

A21. Although a reading of the verb as *i-pá-a-du*, “restrain” (*pādu*) is possible, it comes with great difficulty. Orthographically, this would be the only case in which BA /*pá*/ is used for a form of *pādu*, which is always otherwise written with PA. Contextually, *pādu* (“restrain”) is not an action appropriate to the treatment of oil; it is a sacrificial action descriptive of animal offerings.⁶⁹

The verb *bātu* “to stay overnight,” on the other hand, is known from Middle Assyrian documents to have been used for the standing of liquids, such as aromatics, overnight—in some cases for the purpose of steeping or otherwise maturing.⁷⁰ The verb is known to have been in use at Emar thanks to CM 13 17:33 (*i-ba-at-[tu]*).⁷¹ The

⁶⁸ Note that in WPA the G-stem of *paḥāru* is frequently transitive. Cf. EA 151:66, 149:61 *iphurunim elippātišunu*. The use of the D-stem here conforms to core Akkadian.

⁶⁹ See page 219 for a complete discussion of ritual restraining.

⁷⁰ CAD B s.v. *bātu* mng. 1f. Cf. also mng. 1g (SB).

⁷¹ Daniel Fleming (personal communication) has suggested reading a verb *b’d/bdd* “to be separated” as a West Semitic influence on the language. Such roots are known in Hebrew and Arabic. That reading would suggest that oil was “set aside” or in some other way “separated.”

plurality of the verb suggests that the single winkelhaken between Ì and the *i-* of the following verbal prefix should be read as a defective (incomplete) MEŠ.

A22. In the unlikely case that *enūtu* refers to the NIN.DINGIR (*ēntu*) known elsewhere in Emar ritual, it should be noted that this abstract noun would not designate the *ēntu*-priestess, herself, but rather the institution that she occupies.⁷² Despite references to the position of the *ēntu* from early in the Mesopotamian historical record, the abstraction of the noun is only an ill-attested feature known in NB, best excluded in the present case.

An alternate possibility is to read *enūtu* as a variant form of the more common *unūtu*, “goods; vessels.”⁷³ There is a precedent for *u* > *e* in Emar Akkadian, where most words in which the shift occurs (or does not occur) maintain consistency throughout the Emar corpus.⁷⁴ *unūtu* is abundantly attested throughout the Emar corpus with the initial *u*-vowel, rather than *e*, which makes the case for reading the lemma here strained.⁷⁵

Despite these two interpretive possibilities, I surmise that *enūtu* here is an illusion created by the preceding broken text. If the sequence *e-nu-tu* belongs with its foregoing signs, any number of abstract nouns or plural adjectives with stem CC(*e*)*n* would be possible (e.g. *ummēnūtu*, *zenūtu*), though it is not possible to make a case for any one based on the available text.

⁷² Cf. Arnaud, Emar VI.3, 370.

⁷³ So Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 261. This variant of *unūtu* is known at Mari; cf. ARM 10 96:5; 134:5. ARM 18 36:12 *et al.*

⁷⁴ See Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 138. An exception is *nekurāte* in Emar 652:54, which appears as *nukurāt-* in 608:7 and 651:28.

⁷⁵ Cf. Emar 127:9 *ú-nu-te-e*; 176:6 *ú-nu-ti-šu*; 369:97, *ú-nu-tù-ú*; 545:136 (Hh V-VII) *ú-nu-tu*; CM 13 15:21 *ú-nu-tu*^{meš}. These exemplars traverse genres and tablet-types: Emar 176 (testament) and 545 (ur₅-ra = *hubullu*, now joined to Emar 543A; see Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 128) belong to the “Syrian” scribal convention; Emar 127 (debt-payment notice) and 369 (ritual) are free format.

My translation of the difficult phrase ^d*ha-ši-nu ša* ^dKASKAL as “the god’s processional axe” (literally, “the (divine) axe of the (divine) path”) follows from the observable function of the axe in many of its ritual appearances, which is to accompany gods in procession.⁷⁶ Although the “(divine) path” is not a designation otherwise known, the alternate possibility, to interpret ^dKASKAL as a DN, “the Baliḥ-god,” is not compelling. That name should read ^dKASKAL.KUR(.RA), as it always appears elsewhere in the Emar texts.⁷⁷ Moreover, the (divine) axe that is used frequently in Emarite ritual is never attributed to any one particular god. And, in addition to being unknown, a “(divine) axe of the Baliḥ-god” would out of place in the *zukru* context.

A25. This line and the one that follows comprise a list of items to be arranged (*nadû*) between the *sikkānu*-stones.⁷⁸ Comparison with Text D suggests that one of these items is, itself, a *sikkānu*-stone.⁷⁹ Based on the naming of an individual *sikkānu*-stone in line 16 (the *sikkānu*-stone of ^dNIN.URTA), one might speculate that a particular stone is designated here to be situated between the other *sikkānu*-stones. The phrase “^u ^{na4}*ši-ka-na* *ša* ^dDN” would be a precise fit for the available space.

Arnaud’s *ma-ka-le-e* is unjustified by the partially broken signs. Fleming’s *ma-ka-l*[^{a?}*-t*]ⁱ “food offerings(?)” forces a fem. pl. form of *mākālu*, which is otherwise known to be masc. (cf. line 33). I interpret the word, rather, as *mākaltu*, a type of shallow

⁷⁶ For a detailed discussion of the divine weapon, see pages 66-70.

⁷⁷ Cf., e.g., Emar 168:37; 373: 141, 146, 151; 378:35; 379:8-9.

⁷⁸ See note A25-26.

⁷⁹ Text D line 4: ^u ^{na4}*ha-ar-ši* [...]. Based on the probable equivalence of Text D line 3 with Text A line 24, it seems that *haršu* in D corresponds to *sikkānu* in A.

bowl known to have been used in ritual activities in Assyria and Hattuša and attested in mundane usage at Mari.⁸⁰

A25-26. The antecedent of the masc. sg. suffixes in the phrase *ina libbišu* is probably *birītu* of line 24. Lines 25-26 enumerate items that are placed (*nadû*) in this space.⁸¹

The only other ritual use of *nadû* in Emar is found in Emar 446:51, where a diviner “throws down seed onto the ground” (NUMUN^{mes} *i-na* KI *i-na-di*) during rites for the first month. Especially because of the temporal correspondence, such a rite would be fitting in the *zukru* text. However, lacking any textual evidence for a corresponding phrase here and, furthermore, considering the apparent link with line 25 through the repetition of the words “*i-na ŠÀ-šu*,” we cannot go so far as to suggest that the same rite would have been practiced, here.

A27. For the reading NINDA instead of Arnaud’s “4,” note that the numeral 4 is written with the *last* vertical long—never the first. The ductus of NINDA, on the other hand, varies significantly; writings with a long initial vertical are attested.

A28. The conjectural restoration is based on 373:98, 204 [*ki-i ša u₄-mi ma-ḫi-ri(-im)-ma*]; 409: 9 ([*ki-ma u*]₄-mi *ma-ḫi-ri-im-ma*). It is also possible that a specific day is noted,

⁸⁰ Cf. CAD M1 s.v. *mākaltu*. Fleming recognizes the possibility of reading the signs in this way, but remarks that a plural form would be needed, in light of the preceding numeral 2 (*Time at Emar*, 266). But rather, in the case when a noun is expressed syllabically—which is much rarer than logographic expressions—in the formulae “cardinal numeral + noun” and the numeral is “2,” the noun may be singular, dual, or plural. See further, Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 448.

⁸¹ For the use of *nadû* to describe the arrangement of cultic offerings, see CAD N s.v. *nadû* mng 2a-2’.

though in either case it is certainly the 15th of the month that is in view.⁸² It is only through this line that we know the shorter *zukru* celebration was a seven-day celebration, like its longer counterpart.

A31. There are two possible explanations for the form *li-LI-e-ti* < *lîlâtu* (*lîliatu*). The first prefers the reading *li-le-e-ti* /*lîlêti*/ < *lîliati* where *i* + *a* > *ê*. That contraction, which is characteristic of Mari Akkadian, seems not to be in force at Emar, making this an aberration. Alternatively, if the reading is *li-li-e-ti* /*lîlieti*/ < *lîliati*, then (1) *e* is an allophone of *a*⁸³ and (2) the form is a rare example of non-contraction of adjacent vowels.⁸⁴

Fleming notes that, of the materials determined with H1.A in this text, only É fits the visible traces.⁸⁵ I would extend that observation to apply to all materials determined within the ritual corpus.⁸⁶ Fleming's translation, "the sanctuaries(?) are (in) the return," suffers the difficulty of not making sense. Fleming has underestimated the line-initial lacunae. The need for extra space in the following line accommodates the restoration of the verb that was erased from the end of the present line⁸⁷ at the beginning of line 32 to complete the clause. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine what that verb is.

⁸² If a specific day were named, I would expect "*i-na* [*u*₄]-*mi* 7 *ki-ma* *u*₄-*mi* [1]." This seems to be what Fleming has in mind with his restoration of "[15(?)]," though the sentence, "On the seventh day just as (on) the [15th(?)] day" would be surprising for its vacillation between naming a day of the festival (7th day) and day of the month (15th day). Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 262-63.

⁸³ Cf. Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 148-49.

⁸⁴ So Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 150. Note, however, that the same conundrum exists once elsewhere in Emar Akkadian: *ASJ* 13 30:6 *ki-e-em*. For this case, Seminara (unexpectedly) reads the form as *kêm* (*i* + *a* > *ê*), describing it as "un fenomeno del tutto isolato." *L'accadico di Emar*, 149.

⁸⁵ *Time at Emar*, 267.

⁸⁶ The only possible alternatives are UDU and GUD, though each would require more of the sign to be broken than either Arnaud's drawing or Fleming's collation note represent.

⁸⁷ See Arnaud's line drawing.

My translation assumes that “the return (ceremony)” is the subject of the action since it is grammatically nominative, though the meaning of the line is elusive.

A32. The singular verb *upahḥarma* may be one of several masculine singular verbs in the text whose subject is unclear, probably due to the line-initial breakage (cf. lines 10, 36, 52, 53).⁸⁸ In spite of the fact that lines 19 and 43 contain the plural verb *upahḥarū*, the correctness of the singular number in this line is suggested by the singular verb *lubbušma* earlier in the line (visible in manuscript D).

The reading of the text between *kalûma* and *upahḥarma* is difficult, due in part to surface abrasion of the tablet and in part to unusual paleography. Arnaud and Fleming read forms of the verb *šamādu*, though the final sign of the sequence does not easily comport to the TUM /*du*₄/ (Arnaud) or TI /*di*/ (Fleming) that the commentators suggest.⁸⁹ Conversely, the sign-form is a perfectly good GEŠTIN (see, e.g., Emar 373+:27).

A33. It is unclear whether this text makes a sharp distinction between UDU and SILA₄ or rather, like Emar 373, uses the terms somewhat interchangeably. In the latter case, the reading of this line would be “^{udu}SILA₄” and only a single ovine would be envisioned.

A34. Fleming correctly reads the verb *isallūsu* “do three times,” though his understanding of it in the context can be improved. He treats *ina libbi tūrṭi isallusū* as a clause-ending

⁸⁸ Seminara believes that the plural suffix has been elided as a device—perhaps an unintentional one—to avoid the accumulation of suffixes. *L'accadico di Emar*, 358.

⁸⁹ Cf. TUM in lines 27, 31 and TI in line 13. Rather than TI /*di*/, Fleming may have intended to transcribe DIM /*di*₁₁/ = /*ti*/, which would be a reasonable fit. In any case, the resultant form *išammedi* is puzzling.

phrase, translating, “[...] they repeat three times in the midst of the return.”⁹⁰ Instead, the verb should stand in hendiadys with a following verb (now lost in the break) to render, “a third time they will [verb].”⁹¹

A35. My translation “they will rub it” reflects the D-stem verb *šukkulu*, “to wipe, rub, polish.” Such an action could be parallel to the rubbing of substances on *sikkānu*-stones that is designated elsewhere in the *zukru* texts by *pašāšu* or *terû*. Since the context deals with food offerings, however, it is possible to understand *ušakkalû* as a Š-stem of the root *akālu* “to eat.” It is impossible to say who or what is to be “fed,” in this case.

A37-38. The previous editions have not recognized the phrase UDU *ša* Û.TU in these lines, which has resulted in problematic readings. For the end of each line Fleming reads *tuqaddiš* and *tuellil*, apparently 3 fem. sg. D-stem forms.⁹² These would introduce some female actor, unnamed in the preserved text, whose role and significance is entirely obscured. But the forms are also troubling, grammatically. *tuqaddiš* violates the standard D-stem vowel pattern, *tuparras*, which operates regardless of the thematic vowel of the root in most cases.⁹³ *tuellil* suffers the same deficiency, with the added problem of the

⁹⁰ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 263.

⁹¹ See CAD Š1 s.v. *šalāšu* mng. 1 for examples of the hendiadic usage of the verb. It is also possible that, rather than noting the third performance of an action, the verb means to express that an action is now to be done three times. Such is the case in BM 121206 VI 29', also in a processional context (though not expressed with *šalāšu*), when the participants “raise [something] three times in front of the god” (*tar-ši DINGIR 3-šu ul-la*). Govert van Driel, *The Cult of Aššur* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 13; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969), 89.

⁹² *Time at Emar*, 262. Arnaud reads *tuqaddiš* for line 37, and proposes only “*tu e-li-il*” for line 38, apparently understanding *elēlu* in the stative and declining to utilize the TU.

⁹³ Changes in theme vowel in Emar Akkadian are generally limited to G-stem conjugations. See Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 338-39. The only two exceptions listed there are the verbs presently under consideration.

lack of elision of the initial stem vowel; the expected form is *tullal*.⁹⁴ It is not inconceivable that the vowel class is changed under the influence of the West Semitic D-stem, *yaqattil*-.⁹⁵ But such influence is not otherwise notable in the Emar Akkadian D-stem, which strains the plausibility of encountering such a phenomenon twice in successive lines.⁹⁶

Once the erstwhile prefix syllable *tu-* is removed for inclusion with the preceding sequence, the remaining forms are perfectly good masc. sg. stative verbs, *qadiš* and *elil*, parallel in both form and meaning.⁹⁷ The masculine gender of these implies a ram rather than a ewe and thus suggests that the phrase refers to a mature sheep whose reproductive capabilities are emphasized.⁹⁸

The specification of the reproductive feature of the sheep is elusive is consistent with the primary theme of the *zukru* ritual, as will be discussed in detail, below. The broad interest of Emar 373 in (re-)productivity—of livestock as well as agriculture—resonates with the naming of a breeding(-age) ram here. The involvement of the breeding(-age) ram might symbolize the reproductive prosperity that is desired for all flocks. Furthermore, the concern for purity of these members of the flock calls to mind

⁹⁴ The form *tu'ellil*, with a strong aleph, is not graphically impossible. Whether non-elision of the initial vowel in a I-aleph stem in the D-stem was a more common phenomenon in Emar Akkadian is difficult to discern due to a paucity of exemplars in the archives. One example, found in Emar 271:5, points towards elision: *tuhharaššu*.

⁹⁵ So Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 338-39. He suggests this for *tuqaddiš*, alone, as he follows Arnaud's reading of the verb in line 38 as stative.

⁹⁶ Cf. lines 10, 14, 19, 32, 35, 41, and 43, which demonstrate the expected pattern for D-stem present conjugations.

⁹⁷ The more common core Akkadian stative of the verb *elēlu* is *ēl*, though a strong form *elil* is also known in the SB dialect; cf. GAG §110d; Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 429.

⁹⁸ Cf. CAD A1 s.v. *alādu* mng 1b. Û.TU is used in the Emar archives once to refer to sheep—in this case ewes—who have already lambed (Emar 323:1). The specification of this quality of ewes is known also at Nuzi, cf. HSS 248:8 (7 *enzu ša ulladū*) and 311:1 (21 *UDU^{mes} SAL ša Û.TU*). If Emar 375+ means to designate a ewe rather than a ram, despite the fact that the stative verb is masculine, then perhaps that ewe would be the antecedent of the feminine singular pronominal suffix in line A39.

the prescription to purify livestock in this text (line 10) and the festival text (line 176).

Clearly the purity of domesticates is a priority for the *zukru* rituals.

In any case, the awkwardness of these lines as compared to their textual surroundings cannot be avoided. Stative verbs are uncommon, though not unknown, in the ritual literature.⁹⁹ We should not expect the statement to relate the result of a foregoing ritual action; such consequences are never expressed in the prescriptive rituals. Considering, however, the non-fientive verbal idiom along with the semantic parallelism between lines 37 and 38—a truly striking feature in an otherwise practical, administrative text—the formula gives the impression of being a speech-act. That is to say, it is with the utterance of the words themselves that the desired result is achieved. Though it is impossible to ascertain from the broken context, the phrase could even be a recitation or incantation, perhaps to be uttered at the moment of slaughter.¹⁰⁰

A39. The verb *qâdu* can designate both the kindling of a fire or the consumption of an object by fire.¹⁰¹ The antecedent of the fem. sg. object pronoun is lost in the break.

A41. Perhaps GAL *ku-ba-di* refers instead to “the major Glorification” that is referenced in Emar 369:10, 30; 452:35; 463:4.¹⁰² Those instances, however, present the expected word-order *ku-ba-di* GAL/*ra-ba-a*. Here it is more likely that GAL modifies the lost noun

⁹⁹ The veiling rite of Dagan is several times describe in stative terms in Emar 373+, e.g. lines 18 (*kuttumû*), 164, and 172 (*petû*).

¹⁰⁰ Only one clear instance of direct speech is quoted in the Emar ritual corpus: Emar 370:83. The *maš'artu* initiand enters the temple of (H)ayya (Ea) and says “Indeed I drew water to bathe my mistress Aštartu [...]” (A.MEŠ *a-na ra-ma-ki 4Iš8-tár GAŠAN-ia lu-uh-bi-mi*), using a precative verbal form.

¹⁰¹ According to CAD Q s.v. *qâdu*, this root is attested only in OB and SB. However, it is known also in Ugaritic (*mqd*, G pass. ptc., KTU³ 4.158:19), which lends credence to the idea that it would be current in contemporaneous Emar.

¹⁰² So Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 263.

whose plurality marker, 𒄩.A, still remains. Especially since the Glorification Ceremony, which is known to be practiced at threshold locations in the *zukru* rituals, is the subject of the line, it is possible to restore [KÁ^h]^{i.a} GAL, though the expected form would be KÁ.GAL^{hi.a}, as in line 51.¹⁰³

A42. TA seems to be written in error in place of graphically similar ŠA, since a verb *tapāru* is not known in Akkadian or its West Semitic cousins.¹⁰⁴

A43. See line 19 for the parallel phrase.

A44. I read *ubbalū*, G-stem pres. of *wabālu*. However, *uballū*, D-stem pres. of *balū* “extinguish” is possible as well.¹⁰⁵ Since fire has been kindled (line 39) and the Glorification Ceremony, which involves burning, has been performed (line 40-41), the act of extinguishing fire is not out of place.¹⁰⁶ But in all likelihood the verb’s 3 masc. pl. acc. suffix refers to the same objects that are “collected” in line 43, and now prescribes their disposal.

¹⁰³ On the locations of the Glorification ceremonies in the *zukru* events, see page 89.

¹⁰⁴ Fleming translates “burn,” noting that this verb is equivalent in meaning to *šapāru*. It seems that he has metathesized the final two consonants of the verbal root, however, as the translation is appropriate to *šarāpu*, instead.

¹⁰⁵ Fleming’s collation drawing (*Time at Emar*, 303) precludes Arnaud’s reading of the first, mostly broken sign as UB, which would have made a form of *wabālu* necessary. Fleming’s collation note, which reads Û disagrees with his edition, which reads Ú; either is possible based on the traces. If the reading is, in fact, Û, this line is one of several instances of the use of Û as a verbal prefix in this text.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. 373:36-37, 62-63

A46. The first visible sign may be a defective Ú, denoting a vocalic ending on a forgoing word. Fleming's NUN is possible, though unintelligible in the context.¹⁰⁷ It is also possible to read RI, lacking its medial winkelhaken, preceded by the last vestige of TA to render "dEN *bi-ta-ri*" known in text C.¹⁰⁸ If this were the case, however, then text C would have a more expansive reading than text A, as the lacuna between "*bi-ta-ri*" and *šarbātu* in C contrasts with the contiguous occurrence of these two lemmata in A.

The presence of Euphrates poplar (*šarbatu*) as a ritual good in this line and the next has been hitherto overlooked (see further page 99). Arnaud reads *Za-ar-ma-a-tu*(/tu₄), attributing it as the name of deity, despite (1) the lack of divine determinative in either line for both copies in which it occurs and (2) the absence of evidence for a deity of this name at Emar or elsewhere.¹⁰⁹ Fleming renders instead an unexplained group called "*sarmātu*-women," who would be the subject of the putatively 3 fem. pl. verb that follows.¹¹⁰ In addition to the opaqueness of this interpretation, it should be noted that in line 47 the term governs a 3 masc. pl. verb, making the identification of a feminine plurality less compelling.

¹⁰⁷ NUN occurs in the ritual corpus only once, in the logogram Ì.NUN.NA (Emar 452:4). It is not possible, syntactically, to read NUN = *rubû*, "prince," which is additionally unattested in the ritual corpus. Fleming declines to translate. *Time at Emar*, 265.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. 375C:12.

¹⁰⁹ Arnaud understates the problem when he notes, "Le déterminatif divin devant Zarmatu est apparemment absent dans A et de B [= our Text C²]." (Emar VI.3, 428). Indeed, A and C² are the only copies that contain the line at all and the DINGIR sign is absent in both. Pentiuc exacerbates the problem by reconstructing a temple for the alleged god Zarmatu (line 46: [É^d]ZA-ar-ma-tu) and making it the destination for ritual activity (*West Semitic Vocabulary*, 81-82, 192-93).

¹¹⁰ If derived from Akkadian *sarāmu*, "to cut," a semantic correspondence to the verb *hatāku*, "to decide," whose most literal meaning, as seen in its Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic cognates, is probably "to cut" would be revealed. It is curious, however, that different verbal roots are employed for the noun and its verb, even if they share reference to the essential act of "cutting." It is conceivable that the fixed title of the group, *sarmātu*, utilizes a root that has fallen out of parlance at the time of the writing of the text

Recognition of the poplar's role in Emar 375 confirms Fleming's interpretation of the verb *iḥattaka* as "cut," as the (branches of the?) trees must be chopped prior to their preparation alongside tamarisk in the following line.¹¹¹

A47. Despite Arnaud's assertion that his reading ^{giš}GI[GIR] "est sūr," neither his drawing nor Fleming's collation notes bear it out. The reading ^{giš}ŠINIG is speculation based on Emar 373:168 and its co-occurrence with another type of wood, the Euphrates poplar (*šarbatu*).

A50. The visibility of the NA and BI signs handily facilitate the mistaken impression that the common phrase *ina birit sikkānāti* should be restored here.¹¹² Considering that this phrase should take about twice as much space as the break permits and that Text C suggests another reading that also accounts for the sequence NA-BI (/pī/), the reading offered here can be considered certain.

Because the immediate context refers to "oxen and ewes," it may be the case the *napištu* refers not to "life" in the abstract but rather "living beings" or, specifically, "livestock."¹¹³ Such a usage of the term is attested only poorly in Akkadian, however, and thus can only be considered a possibility.

¹¹¹ Rather than Fleming's reading of the verb as 3 fem. pl., it must instead be 3 masc. sg. + ventive, as parsed by Pentiuc (*West Semitic Vocabulary*, 81). Pentiuc, however, proposes the reading *i-ha-da-qā* based on the Arabic root *ḥadaqa*, "to surround, to circuit, go round about" (see Lane 532a mng. 4), which is not feasible based on the context.

¹¹² So Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 264.

¹¹³ CAD N s.v. *napištu* mng. 2b-2'.

A54. The form of *ušaqqilū* is preterite, which might indicate that this final line¹¹⁴ is an *ex post facto* notation that deals with the practical accounting of expenses disbursed for the event.¹¹⁵ If the verb is, rather, to be considered part of the ritual prescriptions—that is, a D-stem present form—some aberrant vocalism would be in effect.¹¹⁶

Text B: Textual and Philological Notes

B3. Fleming reads a partially preserved UD at the end of the line. But since he does not reproduce it in his collation notes and it is nowhere visible in Arnaud’s line drawing, there is no basis on which to represent it here.

B8. The reading *uqaddašu* has gone unrecognized in previous editions for two reasons. One is that the GA-sign /*qá*/ ¹¹⁷ is short one vertical, ¹¹⁸ which, combined with the misapprehension of the columnar winkelhakens as a broken vertical wedge, results in a sign looking rather like KAL. ¹¹⁹ The second is the non-standard use of Û as a verbal prefix. Although this feature is surprising, it is not without analogue in the Emar texts—

¹¹⁴ Note, however, that Text C contains two additional lines beyond this point that were not inscribed on the tablet of text A.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Emar 369:43, where texts A and B record different donations to the diviner for the ritual performance, giving the impression that a practical matter of accounting is at stake. Fleming explores this idea in “Emar’s *entu* Installation: Revising Ritual and Text Together.”

¹¹⁶ See note A37-38.

¹¹⁷ For the less common value GA = /*qá*/ in the ritual corpus, see Emar 452:15, ^d*Iš₈-tár ša bi-ri-qá-ti* “Aštartu of Lightnings.” Emar 446:85 may attest the value in *bu-GA-ra-tu₄*, though the word is not well-enough understood to know for sure.

¹¹⁸ Such paleographic variation is common enough as not to warrant any textual emendation here. For another example of a two-vertical GA, see Emar 373:44.

¹¹⁹ Such is the reading of both Fleming (ù KAL-*da-šu*; *Time at Emar*, 260) and Arnaud (ù LAB *da šu*; Emar VI.3, 370 n.8-9), despite not being able to make sense of the word. However, Arnaud’s composite edition (based on Text A) reads for this line “[...] ù-*pa-a*]-*da-šu*.” It seems that the first three signs, despite their placement in brackets, represent the reading of Text B line 8; the use of Û as a verbal prefix betrays as much. This reading suggests that Arnaud understood the sign that he gives as LAB in his footnote to be, rather, PA-A. A form of *pādu* would be unexpected here since comparison with Text A suggests that the action should occur “between the *sikkānu*-stones”—a location never elsewhere associated with *pādu*—and no animals are designated in the preserved text as objects for the verb.

indeed in the Emar 375 complex, itself (cf. 375A:41, *ku-ba-di ù-ka-ba-du*).¹²⁰

“Consecration,” designated with a D-stem form of *qadāšu*, is an action known from a number of Emar ritual texts.¹²¹

Text C: Textual and Philological Notes

C10. In humans, *kabbartu* refers to an anatomical location below the shin—likely the ankle—that might correspond to the fetlock of a quadruped, though it would be surprising if that bony joint were determined with UZU. More likely the shank, located above the knee, is envisioned.¹²² In biblical ritual, the shank (*šôq*; or thigh) is used as an esteemed portion of sacrificial offering, usually for human consumption: the right rear shank is the portion of the priests (Exod 29:22, Lev 7:32, 33; 8:25f; 9:21, Num 18:18); it may be raised as elevation offering in sacrificial ritual (Exod 29:27; Lev 7:34; 10:14f, Num 6:20).¹²³

C15. The G-stem participle *e-ri-šu* need not be singular since, especially when used as a noun, the masc. pl. participle can attract a nominal-looking ending (thus, *ērišū*, “sowers”).¹²⁴ Since the word is in construct, recognizing its plurality also alleviates the problem of its having a case-ending; *ēriš eršēti* would be expected for the singular. That

¹²⁰ See also Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 228, which cites Emar 256:6 *ù-ul*, among exceptional graphic representations of the /u/ phoneme.

¹²¹ Cf. esp. Emar 373:205 as well as Emar 369:6; 385:26, 29; 386:2; 387:2; 394:28.

¹²² Also Fleming, “hock,” *Time at Emar*, 265.

¹²³ In the 1 Samuel narrative, the shank is also set aside and served to Saul, the honored guest, in the ritual of feasting (1 Sam 9:24).

¹²⁴ See John Huehnergard, *A Grammar of Akkadian, Third Edition* (HSS 45; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001), 195 (§20.1).

the *nomen rectum* of the construct sequence, *erṣētu*, is not properly declined need not be worrisome since *er-ṣe-tu₄* is a gloss for the logogram KI.

C19. The lost noun that is determined with 𒄩I.A should not be the subject of the verb *irrub*, due to the latter's 3 sg. form.¹²⁵ There is enough room in the lacuna to accommodate a singular subject who "enters" *with* some objects or even *from* (among?) some other objects/places.

Text D: Textual and Philological Notes

8. The (double) conjunction *–ma u* occurs with enough regularity at Emar so as not to be surprising here, despite its rarity in standard Akkadian.¹²⁶ According to Seminara, it may indicate causality, *consecutio temporum*, adversitivity, conditionality, or connection of main and subordinate clauses, in addition to its use as a general coordinating conjunction.¹²⁷

9. The LI-sign in this line is the only diagnostic sign-form in the fragment to determine its composition in the Free Format.

13. The top of a single, right vertical is visible in Fleming's collation note that would correspond to *ša*. The reading is compelled by parallel to text A.

¹²⁵ Cf. Fleming's "UDU^{hi.a}(?)...*i-ru-ub*" (*Time at Emar*, 264).

¹²⁶ Cf. GAG §156b

¹²⁷ Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 550.

The zukru Ritual of the City of Emar

In spite of appearing in four manuscripts, one of which is reasonably well-preserved, the image of the *zukru* ritual depicted in the Emar 375+ tablets is fragmented. Physical lacunae are only partially to blame—they merely exacerbate the larger problem of terseness in the textual description. The Emar rituals, like many other ritual literatures, assume an intimate, preexisting knowledge of how the ritual should unfold and a native understanding of the culture’s symbolic system. Lacking both, this study offers two measures of recourse. Firstly, the texts can be dissected and their constituent parts scrutinized for individual significance. Understanding each component of the ritual helps to illuminate the overall event after being strung together into a productive “syntax.” Secondly and conversely, the text can be viewed from the larger perspective of the Emarite ritual system and, moreover, in the context of Emar’s socio-political world. This analytical chapter pursues primarily the first of these methods, leaving the larger historical picture to the second part of the book.

Despite the oddity of Emar 375+A’s Conventional scribal format and the unique phenomenon of its copying into the Free Format, Emar 375+ otherwise appears to be of a piece, textually, with other Emarite ritual documents. It begins with the standard introductions: “Tablet of the rites of ...” and “When the city/people of Emar [perform/give this ritual].” It moves through its prescribed events using dating formulae (“on the *n*th day they will...”) and markers of time (“on that same day...”) that are common to the other rituals.

In action, the *zukru* ritual depicted in Emar 375+ likewise bears a number of similarities to the other ritual complexes in Emar’s ritual archive. Its small divine cast is

well-known and well-attested in the city and its rituals. Its material locations (e.g. the *sikkānu*-stones) and objects (e.g. the god's axe) are the same that are utilized in other ritual texts. And its manner of ritualizing (e.g. the Glorification Ceremony; the return) are common to the Emarite ritual system.

The *zukru* was a calendrical rite. The people of Emar performed it during the first month of the year, which seems to have begun with the autumnal equinox.¹²⁸ The ritual began on the 15th day of the month, when the year's first full moon would emerge. This correspondence was intentional—the day was specially designated in the text as the day of Šaggar, a regional moon-god. The event's coordination with the light of the full moon suggests a nocturnal or evening setting for at least some of the ritual's events. Although time of day is not made explicit for the events on the important 15th day, the description of a later day's activities stipulates the timeframe “before nightfall,” which could suggest that the ritual was performed at twilight.

The other important date was the 21st of the month, referred to only as “the seventh day” with reference to the 15th of the month. That manner of designation leaves open two possibilities for understanding the schedule of the *zukru* in Emar 375+: either it was a two-day event, with the primary engagement occurring on the 15th and a follow-up ceremony seven days later, or the *zukru* was conceived of as an event lasting seven days. Even in the latter case, the first and last days were clearly the focal points of ritualization. It is unknown what activities would have taken place on the intervening days or how they would have been perceived as ritual days in the overall complex.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 211-13.

¹²⁹ Emar 375A+ does relate some activities for a 16th day, presumably still in the first month, though the relationship of that section to the *zukru* descriptions that precede it is unclear. For further consideration of those activities, see page 97.

On both of the calendrical engagements the ritual revolves around the procession of the statue of Dagan to a place characterized by the presence of *sikkānu*-stones, apparently outside of the city walls. There, various ritual activities took place, such as the offering of sacrifices, feasting, veiling of the deity, acts of purification, and anointing of the *sikkānu*-stones, themselves. The activities were concluded with a return procession into the city when Dagan would have been returned to his temple.

None of the aforementioned features of the ritual in any obvious way suggests a meaning for the ritual complex, as a whole. To search for monosemy in ritual, at any rate, would be fallacious, since subjectivity and adaptability are parts of the very essence of ritual. Instead of advocating for a single interpretation of the event, I prefer to consider the nexus of meanings suggested by the ritual actions, their actors, and their timing as they particularly come together in the *zukru*. Fleming has suggested that, at its root, the *zukru* celebrates the primacy of Dagan as ruler of the gods. Such an interpretation may be part of the story, since Dagan is essentially the only god attended to in this version of the ritual. But by no means is it the whole story of the ritual, nor even an essential interpretation of it.

Without claiming to encapsulate the entire ritual in a single interpretation, in this analysis (and in that of the following chapter) I give special attention to an aspect of the *zukru* that has not been covered as an interpretive thread in the ritual. The *zukru* is at least in part concerned with agro-pastoral fecundity. The text never makes such an agenda explicit, nor should we expect it to do so. Rather, such an understanding is accumulated through textual details that betray such an interest. Not least among them is the timing of the ritual at the beginning of the fall planting season and the ritualization of the

appearance of the full moon—a symbol of fertility especially for livestock. The god ^dNIN.URTA, the owner of agricultural lands, is the only deity aside from Dagan clearly referenced in the text. Similarly, a group of people called “the ones who plow the land” stand as a clear indication of agricultural interest even as the role of those plowmen is shrouded. The symbolic action of “smashing clods” very likely carries a symbolic reference to preparation for agricultural work. And an explicit, though obscure, reference to the sexual fertility of livestock (as well as its purity) shows the matter of pastoral productivity to be at stake.

The *zukru* ritual revolved around Dagan, the chief god, and his visit to a group of *sikkānu*-stones (of undetermined number) outside of the city. The festivities that occurred there very likely served, in part, to entreat the god for bounty in harvest and husbandry when the year’s agricultural season was beginning. Each of the ritual elements that support that objective, as well as those that appear to cast the ritual’s goals in different lights, will be exposed in the analysis that follows.

Gods and Men in the zukru Ritual

To begin to describe the *zukru* ritual synthetically, the first step is to account for the ritual’s picture of divinity, since it characterizes itself at the outset as an offering to a god. What is consistent among all *zukru* texts is that Dagan was the primary participant and ultimate divine honoree of the ritual. The event was dedicated to Dagan, using the idiom of “giving” the ritual to the god.¹³⁰ When read in tandem with the festival version, it is striking that the god honored in the shorter *zukru* is simply called “Dagan,” without

¹³⁰ Cf. Emar 373:169-70 and 375:1-2.

any specified aspect or manifestation; the particular aspect of Dagan as *bēl bukkari* is an important feature of the festival version.¹³¹ But Dagan is not completely without titular distinction in the text. He is called the “‘head’ of the *zukru*” (*rēš zukri*, line 17). This title is unique not only because it is attested nowhere else, but also because the metaphorical usage of *rēšu* to indicate a rank or position, known well in core Akkadian and the West Semitic languages, is not otherwise encountered in Emar texts. Clearly the designation represents a position of priority for Dagan in the ritual proceedings, but the polyvalence of the term makes this role unclear. Perhaps he was simply the “first” (*rēšu*) to march in processions or, alternately, designated as the “chief” or “grand marshal” (*rēšu*) of the celebration.

Whatever the implications of his title, it is clear that the shorter *zukru* revolves around the activities of Dagan. He is the recipient of sacrificial offerings; he processes to a place where *sikkānu-stones* are located (lines 4-7); he is subject to rites of veiling (lines 4, 10); he is present for feasting by the human participants (line 27); and he performs (re)entry into the city (line 10). All these actions will be attributed to Dagan in the festival version, as well, so despite its more grandiose presentation, insofar as the participation of Dagan is a key element of the ritual, the versions align quite well, in outline.

Dagan’s divine company is severely limited in this ritual. He is, in fact, the only active participant. The shorter *zukru* operates with only a skeleton crew of named deities. There is a group called “the gods” that is referenced twice in the text (lines 21, 29), but whether it should be understood to refer to only to the aforementioned gods of the text or

¹³¹ See pages 164-85 for in-depth discussion of this divine title.

rather to indicate the involvement of more (or all) of Emar's gods is unclear. In the festival version, frequently "all the gods" (*ilū gabbū*) are brought out in procession for the festival events. But, in the absence of an adjective to describe "the gods" in Emar 375+, it would be a mistake to import this aspect of the festival version onto it. In any case, there is no indication that the other gods of the city were honored in the shorter *zukru* event and certainly nothing like the festival text's long, hierarchical list of donations to deities of practically every shrine in the region exists in this shorter version.

Two gods, ^dNIN.KUR and ^dNIN.URTA, are mentioned by name in the text, though almost nothing can be said about the involvement of either, since the broken state of the tablets has eliminated the contexts of their appearances.¹³² It may, in fact, be the case that ^dNIN.URTA did not actually have a direct role, at all. His name appears in the text only with reference to a *sikkānu*-stone that is known as "the *sikkānu*-stone of ^dNIN.URTA" (lines 16, 23-[24]).¹³³ This text contains the only references to such a dedicated stone in the Emar corpus, though it calls to mind another deity who is consistently associated with a *sikkānu*-stone: the goddess Ḫebat, whose *sikkānu*-stone is anointed during the festival for the initiation of the NIN.DINGIR priestess of ^dIŠKUR and receives sacrificial offerings during the *zukru* festival.¹³⁴ Despite the fact that the *sikkānu*-stones continually mentioned in the *zukru* texts are clearly features of the extramural landscape, it is clear that neither the stone associated with ^dNIN.URTA nor that of Ḫebat was a denizen of the countryside. In Emar 375+, the *sikkānu* of

¹³² For discussion of the figures called ^dEN *bi-ta-ri* and ^dEN *Ḫa-la-ab*, see pages 97-98.

¹³³ *sikkānu*-stones are commonly understood in all cases to be aniconic representations of individual deities. Such may well be the case in the instances of ^dNIN.URTA and Ḫebat, whose stones do seem to be treated like gods. However, it is far from clear that this is the only or even primary function of a *sikkānu*-stone, so I do not take it for granted that reference to one in the *zukru* text is tantamount to involving the god, himself, who owns it. For a fuller, though inexhaustive, discussion of the *sikkānu*-stones, see pages 75-83.

¹³⁴ Cf. Emar 369:34, 35; 373:159.

^dNIN.URTA is mentioned around the same time that items are “collected to the temple of Dagan,” which was likely to be an urban location. Emar 369 more explicitly specifies the residence of Hebat’s *sikkānu*-stone as being located within the *bīt Gadda*, an urban location that also served as a residence for the storm-god.¹³⁵

While the context of the involvement of this stone associated with ^dNIN.URTA is too damaged to produce a full understanding, its presence in the ritual otherwise centered on Dagan seems to parallel rites in the festival version. There, Dagan performs a rite of unification with ^dNIN.URTA, during which those gods join one another in a chariot for a ritualized reentrance into the city.¹³⁶

The divine name ^dNIN.KUR appears only once in the shorter *zukru* text (line 11). Because of the surrounding textual breaks, leaving the divine name to stand alone, nothing substantive can be said about her participation. However, it must be noted that one cannot be certain that it is the goddess, herself, that is mentioned here. In the oldest of the calendrical systems attested in the Emar documents, a month called ^dNIN.KUR(RA) was the second month of the year, following the month of Zarātu.¹³⁷ Is it possible that this line would have contained a date formula? It is presently impossible to judge, but it is necessary to grasp the consequences of such a reading, were it accurate. Instead of being a succinct practice in contrast to the multi-month format of the festival version, the presence of the month of ^dNIN.KUR would indicate that Emar 375+ had a

¹³⁵ On the *bīt Gadda*, see Fleming, *Installation*, 115-16.

¹³⁶ For the rite of divine unification, see pages 257-58.

¹³⁷ See Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 198. Note, however, that Mark Cohen now denies the existence of separate calendars, preferring to see the diversity in names as variant designations of the same months. See his *Festivals and Calendars of the Ancient Near East* (Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2015), 330-33 (I thank my colleague Paul Allen for calling my attention to this new reference). Cohen fails to account for the complete consistency of calendrical designations and scribal type, which should argue in favor of system rather than ungoverned alternation between formal and descriptive names.

temporal framework just like that of Emar 373+. The two versions would share a movement from rites of the first month (Zarātu in 375+; SAG.MU in 373+) to the second (^dNIN.KUR.RA in 375+; Niqalu in 373+) before returning to the first month in the subsequent year. This interpretation would demand that the idea of Emar 375+ as an annual practice be abandoned; it would be a different version of the same type of septennial festival recorded in Emar 373+. ¹³⁸ In fact, there is nothing in Emar 375+ strictly to suggest annual periodization or to preclude a septennial framework. The missing left edge of the tablet, where the date formulae would stand at the beginning of each relevant line, holds the shorter *zukru*'s timing in ambiguity. These considerations highlight how important it is to bear in mind that much is uncertain about the shorter *zukru* text, including both its internal timeframe and its temporal relationship to its longer cousin.

A description of the participation of human actors in the shorter *zukru* is every bit as laconic as that of its divinity. Like the other rituals, the instructions for participation are given in the third person plural, without an expressed subject. The only participants who are ascribed an identity in Emar 375+ are the “townsmen and chiefs of the city” (DUMU^{meš} ù GAL^{hi.a} ša URU.KI), and these only once (line 35). As usual, broken text obscures the nature of the action undertaken by these participants.

The phrase “townsmen and chiefs of the city” must be merismatic for the entire Emarite population. After all, the ritual was described at the outset as being given by “the

¹³⁸ In this case, lines 3-10 would describe the 15th of SAG.MU in what could only be the sixth year of the septennial cycle. Line 11 would begin description for the second month rites in the sixth year, as are known for the 24th and 25th of Niqalu in the festival version. This section would extend, perhaps, through line 19, which seems to be something of a conclusion. Around line 20, then, the seventh year would begin, first with rites for the 15th of Zarātu and moving on towards the 21st of Zarātu in line 28.

city of Emar” as a whole. But the terminology itself deserves some comment. Although (^{lu})GAL is a standard designation for the individual of highest rank in any single institution in the Emar texts (e.g. the chief scribe, ^{lu}GAL DUB.ŠAR), references to GAL^{meš} as a collectivity are much less common. One Conventional Format sale document names a group called LÚ^{meš} GAL.GAL as co-owner and seller, along with ^dNIN.URTA, of the contracted property, standing in place of the elders (*šibūtu*) who otherwise occupy this position in the formulaic sale documents.¹³⁹ This suggests that “Chiefs” is simply an alternate designation of the council of elders, which exercises formidable authority in the municipal economy.¹⁴⁰ Naming the city council members as participants alongside the average townsmen levels the distinctions among these social groups and emphasizes the inclusiveness of the ritual in its shorter form, as in the festival version.

The Performance of the zukru Ritual

The significance of any ritual performance is more than just the sum of its parts. The “syntax” of the ritual—how the parts fit together—and the synergetic experience created by the whole are the ultimate factors in understanding a ritual’s impact in its performative context. But before that higher-level discussion can take place, it is

¹³⁹ RE 34:14. For a discussion of city administration, see chapter 4, pages 297-310.

¹⁴⁰ So Gary Beckman, “Hittite Administration in Syria in the Light of the Texts from Ḫattuša, Ugarit and Emar” in *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria* (ed. Mark Chavalas and John Hayes; Malibu: Undena Publications, 1992), 48. Upholding the distinction between the elders and the chiefs is Michael Heltzer, “The Political Institutions of Ancient Emar as Compared with Contemporary Ugarit (13. – Beginning of the 12. Century B.C.E.),” *UF* 33 (2001), e.g. 223. Several more attestations of “chiefs,” as a group, occur in Free Format documents, where we would not expect to find reference to a city governmental institution such as the council of elders. In these cases, the term may be a summary designation of the (Hittite) officials before whom the matter reflected in the document was brought. Some of these tablets are witnessed and sealed by Hittite functionaries, such as the Overseer Mutri-Teššub, who could, themselves, be the “chiefs” referred to in the document (cf. Emar 28:3; 252:2; Subartu 17:1: 6, 7). For the “chiefs” of Šatappi, see Emar 257:4, 6, 8.

necessary to understand the practical details of each ritual action and the theoretical implications of each unit, as individual performances. This discussion treats the primary ritual sub-units separately, while recognizing that, as parts of a whole, every action draws some of its significance from that of its surrounding activities. And although these discussions will begin to raise what are the most important themes of the ritual, a fully synthetic discussion of those themes, as reflected by the ritual practice, as a whole, will be reserved for the conclusion of Part I of this study.

Dagan on Parade: The Processional Rites

Each day enumerated in the *zukru* texts is marked with a divine procession: one to inaugurate the event on the 15th of the month and another on the seventh and final day of the ritual. Compared to those of the longer text, the processional events in Emar 375+ appear somewhat dressed down. The only participant on the 15th is Dagan, himself; on the 21st he is accompanied by some unspecified group of deities. The itinerary is simple: the gods process to a destination that is characterized by the presence of *sikkānu-stones*.

A fuller consideration of the implications of the processional events will take place in the discussion of Emar 373+, where the processions take on a grander scale and are described with more detail. Here it is necessary to bring into focus the most notable aspect of the processions in Emar 375+, which is distinct from those in 373+: the processing of an object called the “god’s axe” (^d*ha-ši-(in-)nu ša DINGIR*) along with the statue of Dagan.¹⁴¹ This type of implement factors prominently elsewhere in Emarite

¹⁴¹ For a sense of what a “god’s axe” might look like in its physical manufacture, see Jordi Vidal Palomino’s discussion of ceremonial weapons described in the Mari texts, “Prestige Weapons in an Amorite Context,” *JNES* 70/2 (2011): 247-252.

ritual¹⁴² and is also known to be designated by the more generic terminology, “weapon of the god(s)” [^{giš}TUKUL (*ša*) DINGIR(-*li*)].¹⁴³ The specification of an axe for the divine weapon is a characteristic feature of the oldest ritual texts: it occurs in each of the three Conventional Format Emar rituals (Emar 375A, 446, and 447). The only other time ^d*ha-šī(-in-)nu* is specified is in the NIN.DINGIR installation text (Emar 369), where it occurs only in the B/C and D texts,¹⁴⁴ interspersed with writings as ^{giš}TUKUL.¹⁴⁵ Fleming has recently suggested that the B/C text is an earlier copy than the A version, perhaps inscribed during the earliest phase of record keeping activity in the M-1 institution under the supervision of the diviner, Ba‘lu-qarrād.¹⁴⁶ If this conclusion holds, it would underscore the earliness of the *haššinnu* terminology and would even provide evidence of a transition point between the variant terms in the B/C text, which still utilizes both.

Whether there was a single divine weapon that served the entire cultic community or various cults possessed their own weapons is unclear.¹⁴⁷ At least in the case of Dagan’s temple, a divine weapon does not seem to be a permanent fixture since instructions are given for it to be stationed (*uššubu*) there during the new moon ritual (*hidašu*) of Dagan on the third day of the month of Ḫalma.¹⁴⁸ In the month of Abû a weapon is brought out

¹⁴² Emar 369:45, 46, 63; 446: 15, 40, 43, 88, 101, 103; 447:14.

¹⁴³ Emar 369: 7, 10, 29, 31, 33; 420:1, 5, 6; 422:11; 452:25. That the “weapon” and the “axe” are the same type of implement is illustrated by Emar 369 B/C and D, which occasionally use *haššinnu* in place of the A text’s ^{giš}TUKUL.

¹⁴⁴ E.g. B/C 45, 46; D 63.

¹⁴⁵ E.g. B/C 7, 10, 29.

¹⁴⁶ See Fleming, “Emar’s *entu* Installation: Revising Ritual and Text Together.” Idem., “Only the *maš’artu*-Priestess Speaks: The Emar Installation Rites in Scribal Context,” forthcoming.

¹⁴⁷ Note that Emar 276, which associates several ^{giš}TUKULs with various cultic personnel is not likely to refer to literal weapons, but rather identifies the listed PNs as a unit of service or “work group” dedicated to a particular cult. For this usage of the term, see Nicoletta Bellotto, “Alcune osservazioni sull’istituzione GIŠ.TUKUL a Emar” *AoF* 29 (2002): 128-145; Jaun-Pablo Vita “Warfare and the Army at Emar” *AoF* 29 (2002): 123. The connection of Emar’s use of the term to the Hittite ^{giš}TUKUL institution was first explored by Masamichi Yamada, “The Hittite Social Concept of ‘Free’ in Light of the Emar Texts” *AoF* 22 (1995): 297-316.

¹⁴⁸ Emar 446:101.

on the occasion of an offering made behind the temple of ^dNIN.URTA, but whether the object came from within that temple or elsewhere is ambiguous. The same goes for the temple of ^dIŠKUR: although the divine weapon plays a conspicuous role in the installation of ^dIŠKUR's NIN.DINGIR, nothing suggests that the weapon used was unique to that cult. Conversely, universality is suggested in that text by the prescription to affix the weapon to ^dNIN.KUR, who will dwell with it in the house of the NIN.DINGIR initiand's father for seven days (Emar 369:46). Clearly the weapon—or weapons, as the case may be—is an implement of significance for many gods that crosses the boundaries of individual cults. This universal character calls to mind other Emarite institutions that transcend cultic divisions, such as the Temple of the Gods (É DINGIR-*li*) or even the office of the Diviner who attends to the religious affairs of the entire city.¹⁴⁹

Despite some variety in the ritual usage of the divine weapon, the common denominator among most of its appearances is its accompaniment of a person or god in processions.¹⁵⁰ Where the context is discernable, this is true of every use of the weapon in Emar 375+: it follows Dagan and his small parade of sacrificial animals on his journey to the *sikkānu*-stones. The six-month ritual calendar (Emar 446) prescribes the same action for the gods ^dNIN.URTA of the 'Gate' of Amita (line 15), Aštar-šarba (line 88), and Ḫalma (line 103).¹⁵¹ The weapon plays an important role in the NIN.DINGIR installation, standing by for the performance of the Glorification ceremonies (lines 10, 31) and

¹⁴⁹ See Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 26–35. Cf. also, with caution, Jan Gallagher, "An Extraordinary Everyday for Emar's Diviner" in *Life and Culture in the Ancient Near East* (ed. R.E. Averbeck et al.; Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2003), 171–81.

¹⁵⁰ Two texts that mention the weapon are fragmentary, but allow enough context to observe that the object is mentioned in connection with a processions: Emar 447:14; 420:1, 5, 6.

¹⁵¹ One additional instance in that text is processional, though the broken context does not permit any further information to be gathered (line 43). The context is still worse in line 40, about which nothing can be said. the only clearly divergent use of the weapon in Emar 446 occurs in line 101, where the weapon takes up residence in Dagan's temple during the new moon ritual of Dagan.

accompanying the new priestess in her processions to her father's house (line 45) and to the *bīt dug-li* (line 63).¹⁵²

This emphasis on mobility accounts for the unique expression in 375+:22, which refers to “the divine axe of the divine (processional) path,” or summarily put, “the god's processional axe” (^d*ḥa-ṣi-nu ša* ^dKASKAL). The processional way of the gods must have been a fixed route, selectively orchestrated to maximize public impact and to theologize selectively by association of the parade with other landmarks and institutions.¹⁵³ The collocation of the axe and the processional path underscores the intimate connection of the divine weapon with the movements of the gods and cultic personnel.

The frequent use of divine weapons in procession calls to mind the so-called “Journey of the Divine Weapon” documented in a number of southern Mesopotamian texts from the Old Babylonian period. These texts record the phenomenon of parading out a ceremonial weapon of a god—usually the chief god of a city—to a stated location for unstated reasons—always during harvest time.¹⁵⁴ The first modern readers of the texts suspected that an honorific festival was suggested by the activity, known simply as “Waffengang des [DN].”¹⁵⁵ More recent studies, however, have seen a less thoroughly ritualized occasion in these references in favor of other, practical functions such as ensuring equitable distribution of harvest yields—hence the harvest-time setting of the journeys—which could later have extended to conferral of authority for settling land

¹⁵² For the divine weapon in the NIN.DINGIR installation ritual, see Fleming, *Installation*, 165-66.

¹⁵³ For selective sacralization in the processional routes of the *akītu* festival, see Beate Pongratz-Leisten, *ina šulmi irub: die kulttopographische und ideologische Programmatik der akītu-Prozession in Babylonien und Assyrien im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr* (Mainz am Rhein: Von Zabern, 1994), 22-23.

¹⁵⁴ Cf., e.g., VAB 5 196; CT 4 18c, 29a, 23c; TCL 1 140:1, 7; CBS 24, 80, 1356.

¹⁵⁵ J. Kohler and A. Ungad, *Hammurabi's Gesetz Band III: Übersetzte Urkunden Erläuterungen*, (Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1909), 242.

disputes or witnessing oath-taking ceremonies.¹⁵⁶ If the procession of the Emarite divine weapon stood in a similar tradition, it would not be the only noted aspect of the *zukru* rituals that posits a symbol of the harvest for a ritual surrounding the time of planting.¹⁵⁷ The invocation of such symbols might help to ensure the productivity of the coming period of agricultural labor. But additionally, as an instrument of divine justice, the weapon may have lent a certain legal force to the rituals, perhaps as a symbolic witness to the transaction between the human and divine participants.¹⁵⁸

Still, it would be a mistake to neglect the fact that in the Emar rituals the weapon never functions alone, but seems rather to be a processional accompaniment. It may be that the primary function of the weapon, as a symbol of divine power, was to ensure protection of the gods and their functionaries in their travels outside of temple confines.

“They Will Smash Their Clods”

After the processional return on the seventh day of the *zukru* ritual, the participants perform an action that is unique in the *zukru* materials: they “smash their clods” (*kirbānišunu upassasū*, line 36). No comparable action presents itself in the longer *zukru* text nor in the rest of the ritual corpus. But the most important feature of the action is the specification of its performers: the “townsmen and chiefs of the city,” which is to say the entire population who can be called “sons of Emar.” This rite is an indicator of

¹⁵⁶ See R. Harris, “The Journey of the Divine Weapon” in *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965* (ed. H.G. Güterbock and T. Jacobsen; AS 16; Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 1965), 217-24. See, more recently, Johanna Spaey, “Emblems in Rituals in the Old Babylonian Period” in *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East* (ed. J. Quaegebeur; OLA 55; Louvain: Peeters, 1993), 411-20, esp. 414-15.

¹⁵⁷ The festival title of Dagan, himself, in Emar 373 refers to the offering of the earliest agricultural produce.

¹⁵⁸ For a discussion of various other functions of divine weapons, see Joanna Töyräänvuori, “Weapons of the Storm God in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Traditions,” *StOr* 112 (2012): 147-180, esp. 152-61.

the inclusiveness of the ritual and the wide involvement of the populace early on in the ritual's development. The *zukru* was an event of social significance for the entire community.

As for the act of clod-breaking, itself, the meaning is difficult to penetrate, though not for lack of comparanda. In fact, the symbolic use of (dirt-)clods was widespread throughout the Near East in the second millennium B.C.E., with a correspondingly extensive variety of meanings. Several of these have their significance in the realm of legal symbolism, which is where the act of destroying a clod (*kirbāna hepû*) is otherwise known. An Old Babylonian document from Sippar records the smashing of a clod in lieu of a lost debt-notice tablet upon the resolution of the debt.¹⁵⁹ In this case, the clod, which, after all, is the very material from which tablets are made, simply stands in for a cuneiform document to allow for the completion of the legal ritual associated with debt-repayment.¹⁶⁰

Clod destruction is also attested in legal contexts in documents from Nuzi and Susa. In these cases, the act symbolizes the dissolution of claims, such as the right of a son to the inheritance that he would normally receive from his father. By performing the clod-destruction rite, the practitioner disbands the familial bonds between father and son and invalidates the son's claim to familial property.¹⁶¹

As similar as these actions are to the ritual requirement in Emar 375+, the legalistic interpretations they suggest are an awkward fit in the context. Both the debt-

¹⁵⁹ CT 48 15.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Meir Malul, *Studies in Mesopotamian Legal Symbolism* (AOAT 221; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 79-93.

¹⁶¹ Malul, *Mesopotamian Legal Symbolism*, 79-80, adopted in Fleming's interpretation of the rite (*Time at Emar*, 109).

resolution and rights-cancellation usages are underscored by the idea of dissolution of a legal relationship. But what union's divorce is at stake in the *zukru* ritual? It seems, quite to the contrary, that the extensive transaction between the gods and humans reflected in the event is a relationship-*building* activity. If anything, renewal is suggested; there is no hint of the need for bringing closure.¹⁶² The breaking of a clod in legal contexts outside of Emar, which, not incidentally, is always expressed with the verb *hepû* rather than *pussusu*, as here, is a red herring.¹⁶³ Despite a phenomenological correspondence, based on what is known about the legal significance of clod-breaking there is no compelling reason to import it into this apparently unrelated ritual context.

Closer to home in Syria, clod-symbolism is attested without the destructive component associated with dissolution. At Ugarit, dirt-clods (*rgbt*) have some significance in the divine sphere. A bowl of clods is given along with two rams and a shekel of silver as a ritual offering to Ba'latu-Bahatīma in a calendrical ritual text, though the significance of the offering and its connection to the recipient are opaque.¹⁶⁴ In another text that contains an excerpt of a myth (apparently a version of the Ba'lu cycle) the clod, with its parallel, "stone" (*'abn*), evokes the divine weapons used by Ba'lu to defeat his divine enemies. Dennis Pardee believes that this reference may help to explain the use of clods in ritual: "The appearance of 'clod(s)' in a ritual text would be based on a

¹⁶² Fleming suggests that the act be seen in the context of oath-taking procedures, which include the threat of curses for transgression. If the clods symbolize the townsmen's claim to the land, then the breaking of it threatens them with the loss of their rights (*Time at Emar*, 109). This is an elegant solution to the problem, that incorporates the comparative data, though it is less than obvious to me that land rights are at stake in the event or that the oath-taking paradigm is otherwise visible in the ritual's structure.

¹⁶³ Cf. CAD K s.v. *kirbānu* 1e-2'. The verb *hepû* was in use at Emar for the act of destroying legal tablets when they were no longer valid; cf. Emar 24:11, 203:8; RE 3:37, 9:26; *ASJ* 12 7:51; CM 13 5:45.

¹⁶⁴ KTU³ 1.112:4.

practice functionally similar, therefore, to the use of the ‘weapons by which the weather deity defeated the sea deity’ in rites at Mari.”¹⁶⁵

While the Ugaritic examples provide a precedent for the use of clods in LB Syrian ritual, the methods of their utilization are a strained comparison for our text, which does not describe the presentation of clods but rather destruction of them. Therefore, finally, we turn to Mari, where we find two notable uses of dirt-clods (*kirbānum*). The first applies in cases when a diviner must take omens concerning a remote location, to which he cannot personally travel. In the event of this scenario, a clod is sent from the place in question, thereby (somehow) enabling the diviner to take omens on behalf of that location from the comfort of his own office. The hepatoscopic process apparently consumes some of the sample, but the remainder is archived for use in future inquiries.¹⁶⁶

The second relevant use is attested in a letter that deals with the matter of the ownership of a field, which was granted to PN₁ in exchange for service to the crown, but has been utilized over the course of a year by PN₂. The text clarifies the terms of the transfer of ownership: “Il faut [que PN₂] récupère l’investissement et ce n’est qu’après la moisson que le *kirbānum* doit être donné à PN₁.”¹⁶⁷ The “giving of the clod” is undoubtedly a ceremonial transfer of ownership rights to land, with the clod standing in for the land, itself.

The common thread in the Mari examples is use of a small piece of earth as a metonym for the larger geographical context from which it derives. Omens can be read

¹⁶⁵ Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit* (WAW 10; Atlanta: SBL, 2002), 212, citing Jean-Marie Durand, “Le mythologème du combat entre le dieu de l’orage et la mer en Mésopotamie” *M.A.R.I.* 7 (1993): 41-61.

¹⁶⁶ Jean-Marie Durand, *Archives épistolaires de Mari I/1* (ARM 26; Paris: ERC, 1988), 41-42. Durand cites especially A.2691, A. 1032, and A. 1584.

¹⁶⁷ A.2342:1’-6’, after Durand, *Archives épistolaires de Mari I/1*, 42.

for Mari's neighboring cities because the entirety of those cities is represented by their clods. Transfer of the abstract legal rights of land ownership can be effectuated by the physical act of transferring a clod of land (presumably from the land to which rights are in question) from one hand to another. Thus the clod represents the land and the action taken with respect to the clod is symbolic of what occurs with respect to the actual land, itself. In this light, it becomes clear that smashing earthen clods corresponds to a practical action to which the land of Emar will be subject: tilling. As a ritual of the first month of the year, concurrent with the inauguration of the planting season, it is natural that a symbolic breaking up of earth occurs here to represent the immediate task of breaking up the earth of arable land on a larger scale in preparation for planting.

Just such a description is used in reference to agricultural preparation in the Sumerian "Debate between the Hoe and Plow." The hoe says to the plow, "you break clods—what does your clod-breaking matter to me?" (*i₃-lagab-be₂-en lagab-ba-zu nam-ĝu₁₀*).¹⁶⁸ Clod-breaking is plowing. In fact, the description of the plow's work as clod-breaking might even suggest that clod-breaking in the *zukru* is not symbolic at all, but rather a prescription for the people actually to go to their fields and do their field preparations. There is no obvious reason, however, that figurative language would be used to direct this requirement. Instead, the text prescribes here a symbolic representation of the act of plowing.

¹⁶⁸ ETCSL 5.3.1:10.

Between the sikkānu-Stones: The zukru's Sacred Space

The primary location for ritual activity in the shorter *zukru* text is a place located “between the *sikkānu*-stones.”¹⁶⁹ The space between the *sikkānu*-stones is really the epicenter of *zukru* events in both this version of the ritual and its longer cousin. This is the destination of the divine processional routes, apparently the location for providing offerings to the gods, and the likely location for the feasts of the citizenry. And the *sikkānu*-stones themselves are the objects of the rite of unction with blood and oil—perhaps the most distinctive practice of the *zukru* complex.

The question of the nature and function of the *sikkānu*-stones opens up to the much larger issue of the cultic use of (standing) stones, generally, which is known especially in the ancient Levant. Other attestations of the word *sikkānu*, for example, can be found in texts from Ebla, Mari, and Ugarit, indicating that both this type of object as well as the terminology used to designate it were pan-Syrian phenomena from the third millennium down to the end of the Late Bronze Age. On a broader horizon, stones of a cultic nature are attested archaeologically throughout the Levant, as well as in textual referents from Palestine (Biblical Hebrew *maššebâ*), Arabia (Arabic *'anṣab*), and Anatolia (Hittite *ḫuwaši-*), though it is not clear that all these types of stones are to be interpreted in the same way.¹⁷⁰ To explore the well-trod yet still contentious problem of (standing) stones in full here would be outside of the scope of this project. Instead I defer to the many works of capable scholars who have sought to understand this phenomenon,

¹⁶⁹ Emar 375A: 6, 7, 8, 13, 24, 52. This place might be equivalent to the “Gate of the *sikkānu*-stones” in the festival text.

¹⁷⁰ Both the Hebrew and Arabic terms derive from the root **nšb* “to stand, erect,” thereby giving them a descriptive name “upright stones.” Nothing about the name *sikkānu*, however, suggests that this type of stone was positioned in an erect fashion, so the assumption that they served the same purpose as “upright stones,” is based on a perceived phenomenological connection.

generally.¹⁷¹ It is the goal of this discussion to understand the upright stones as they appear in the *zukru* festival, in a way that is consonant with the use of such stones elsewhere in Emar.

Explicitly cultic usage of *sikkānu*-stones is found outside of the *zukru* complexes in three¹⁷² of the major Emarite rituals.¹⁷³ One is the installation festival for the NIN.DINGIR of ^dIŠKUR, during which the initiand offers sacrifices to ^dIŠKUR and to “the *sikkānu*-stone of Ḫebat” in a single location and anoints the stone with oil.¹⁷⁴ Unlike the stones most commonly referenced in the *zukru* festival, the *sikkānu*-stone of Ḫebat seems to be a permanent fixture in an urban location.¹⁷⁵ The fact that Ḫebat possessed a *sikkānu*-stone in the built environment of the city shows that *sikkānāti* are not objects solely connected with the sort of extramural landscapes suggested by the *zukru* texts. The anointing of the stone provides an important parallel to the anointing events in the *zukru*

¹⁷¹ For *sikkānāti* in general, see Jean-Marie Durand, *Le culte des pierres et les monuments commémoratifs en Syrie amorrite* (Mémoires de N.A.B.U. 9; FM 8; Paris: SEPOA, 2005). For the use of cultic stones at Emar, specifically, see Patrick Michel, *Le culte des pierres à Emar à l'époque hittite* (OBO 266; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014).

¹⁷² Two additional text fragments attest to the upright stones, though they are too laconic to be useful: Emar 422:4; 431:6. The several other fragments that contain the term can all be related to *zukru* texts: Emar 424, 428, 401, and 397. I reject the presence of the *sikkānātu* in Emar 403:9, which Arnaud transcribes: [...i]d-da-an be-rít^{na4.meš} si-<ka-ne->e-ti. This would be the only case in which the word *sikkānātu* takes an *e*-vowel in the plural, for which no ready explanation can be provided. The reading is, in part, prompted by the use of the preposition *berit*, which is written *be-ri-it* in the only other instance in which it takes this vowel pattern (Emar 398:2). Otherwise the preposition is vocalized *birit* or *berat*. Moreover, this would be the only case in the entire Emar corpus in which the MAR-sign should be read /rít/.

¹⁷³ Only one of these again references the Gate of *sikkānu*-Stones: Emar 388:14, the *kissu* festival for ^dNIN.KUR, which prescribes an offering for Dagan Lord of the Valley at this same location. But with little context and no elaboration concerning the offering, it goes no distance towards illuminating the location in the *zukru*. It could, however, suggest a more permanent connection between (a manifestation of) Dagan and the Gate. Arnaud translates *i-na KÁ si-ka-na-ti* in this case as “tout près des bétyles,” understanding it as a prepositional phrase where KÁ (here “mouth”) is used metaphorically. However, since the phrase is identical to that found in Emar 373+ (with only the NA₄ determinative omitted), I see no reason to suppose a different meaning is intended here. For the proposition that *all* instances of *i-na KÁ* are merely prepositional, see Seminara, 488-89, though his only examples come from the *zukru* text and legal texts which we now know use “*ina KÁ*” to designate a water access district (see page 81, n.192).

¹⁷⁴ Emar 369:34-36. The shrine is the place called *bīt Gadda*, the nature of which is unclear. Cf. Fleming, *Installation*, 115-16.

¹⁷⁵ A *sikkānu*-stone of Ḫebat also appears in the *zukru* hierarchical god-list, where no other specific deity is associated with such an object.

festival. This mode of ritual activity must have been strongly associated with the use of *sikkānu*-stones. The forms of the events, however, are not the same. Emar 369 prescribes the pouring (*tabāku*) of fine oil (Ì DU₁₀.GA) on the “head” (SAG.DU) of the stone, which may have the value of consecrating the object, just as the NIN.DINGIR herself was already consecrated with oil from ^dNIN.KUR’s temple. Unction in the *zukru* is rather described as “smearing” (*pašāšū*), which implies physical contact with an implement (or the hands).¹⁷⁶

The installation festival for the *maš’artu*-priestess utilizes a *sikkānu*-stone in an altogether different way. It calls for the stone to be placed on the roof of a house—most likely the initiand’s house, since that is the location of all foregoing ritual activity¹⁷⁷—and prescribes offerings that seem to be offered in its presence.¹⁷⁸ The stone in this case is not identified with any particular deity and, since it was only erected there for the purpose of the ceremony, seems not to be a permanent fixture. This application of the *sikkānu*-stone more closely resembles their usage in non-cultic contexts in both Emar and Ekalte. In several legal documents, a curse formula is included: “Whoever should change these words—may DN_{1-n} destroy his offspring and his name. May they plant (*zaqāpu*) a *sikkānu*-stone on his house.”¹⁷⁹ Although these instances reflect different applications of placing a *sikkānu*-stone on a building, the objective is the same: to cordon off a physical location from its normal usage for reasons associated with divine presence. In the case of the *maš’artu* installation, the stone marks off otherwise mundane space as sacred space,

¹⁷⁶ In Emar 373+, the verb *terû*, “rub,” is also used, likewise indicating physical contact. For the possibility that (a bunch of) tamarisk was used in at least one case to anoint, see Emar 373+:168. Fleming prefers to see the hands as the tool for anointing (*Time at Emar*, 86).

¹⁷⁷ The text is broken after the word É, which Arnaud translates as “temple,” despite the fact that in the preceding text É has consistently been used in the phrase É^{sal}*maš-ar-ti*.

¹⁷⁸ Emar 370: 41, 43

¹⁷⁹ Emar 125:40; Fs Kutscher 6:34; RE 15:34; MBQ-T 35:25-27; 36:14-19; 41:17-20; 69:25-29; 73:8-11.

appropriate for its role in the unfolding ritual. Likewise, the curse formula promises to devote a marked space to destruction by the gods, here as punishment for offense.¹⁸⁰ It is the physical presence of the stone that enables this transformation, both creating a protected space and announcing its holy character to onlookers.¹⁸¹

The dual functions of marking off and protecting sacred space are characteristics suggested by the word *sikkānu*, itself—probably a West Semitic noun (*qill* + *ān*) derived from the root **skk* (with by-forms *škk*, *swk*, and *śwk*)—with the basic meaning, “to hedge.”¹⁸² The usage of the root in the Hebrew Bible provides especially good points of comparison for the application of the term to sacred landscapes. One telling example is the use of a “covering curtain” (*pārōket māsāk*, also from the root **skk*) to “block off” (*wayyāsek*) the ark within the tabernacle, thereby creating the Holy of Holies, a separate and protected sacred space.¹⁸³ Similarly, the ark, itself, was covered by the mercy seat, with its two golden cherubim with wings outspread, “covering” and, no doubt, protecting, the ark.¹⁸⁴ These examples highlight especially the aspect of demarcating space, while also implying protection of the space. The aspect of protection is elsewhere made

¹⁸⁰ This usage has a strong echo in the biblical *hērem*, the state of being marked off as dedicated to destruction for the sake of the god. Cf. Phillip Stern, *The Biblical Herem: A Window on Israel's Religious Experience* (BJS 211; Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1991). For a recent reevaluation of the concept, see Arie Versluis, “Devotion and/or Destruction? The Meaning and Function of חֵרֵם in the Old Testament,” *ZAW* 128 (2016): 233-46.

¹⁸¹ Fleming has related *sikkānu* to Akkadian *sikkatu*, a “peg” or “nail,” which is known in some cases to have been used as a boundary marker (*Installation*, 78). That would similarly imply that the property is cordoned off, perhaps for destruction or repossession. But, as the etymological considerations below demonstrate, there is no need to reach beyond the implications of the word *sikkānu*, itself, to understand this function. Considering the use of steles in cults of the dead, Manfred Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, and Walter Mayer have suggested that the implication is a wish of death upon the culprit, “Sikkanum ‘Betyl,’” *UF* 21 (1989): 137.

¹⁸² An alternate etymology interprets the nouns as a *qittāl* pattern from the root **skn*, “to dwell;” cf. Michel, *Le culte des pierres*, 28-29. As an interpretation of the stones’ function, this derivation privileges the notion that each stone was a “dwelling place” for individual gods, which does not, in fact, appear to apply to the stones’ usage in all cases.

¹⁸³ Exod 40:21. Cf. Exod 40:3.

¹⁸⁴ Similarly, Ezekiel envisions a cherub as a “guardian” (*sōkēk*) for a people who live on “the holy mountain of God.” Ezek 28:14, 16.

explicit, such as in the book of Job, where the deity creates a figurative space of divine protection around a person, which forces of evil could not penetrate.¹⁸⁵

That demarcation and protection of dedicated spaces were primary functions of *sikkānu*-stones is corroborated by the cases in which the word *sikkānu* is interchangeable with another designation of the same objects, “*ḥarṣu* stones” (^{na4}*ḥa-ar-ṣu*).¹⁸⁶ In Akkadian, the primary meaning of the verbal root *ḥarāṣu* is “to cut down,” sometimes with implications of digging or carving. It is this usage that has led to idea that *ḥarṣu* stones at Emar were in some way “engraved.”¹⁸⁷ In the first millennium B.C.E, under the influence of Aramaic, the use of the verb may take a less literal character, suggesting instead ideas of “determining” or “clarifying,” metaphorically “cutting” between available options. That West Semitic nuance of the cognate term would have been fundamental to the Emarite understanding of the word. In Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic, the primary meanings of “determine” or “designate” are evident and, most revealing of all, the meaning in Arabic is “to rend, cleave”— to divide something into separate parts.¹⁸⁸ That is what the *sikkānu*-stones, sometimes descriptively called *ḥarṣu* stones, did: they divided between sacred and mundane spaces.

The *zukru* texts tell us very little about the nature of the space that contains the *sikkānu*-stones. But the foregoing description of the stones’ function should imply at least the position of the stones within this location. They are, themselves, the boundary of the sacred space. There is nothing in the text to suggest the number or physical positioning of

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Job 1:10.

¹⁸⁶ The term appears once in Emar 373+:22, clearly referring to the same items previously designated as *sikkānāti*. Yet more revealing is the appearance of *ḥarṣu* stones in Emar 375D:3 where the A text (line 24) contains, instead of *sikkānāti*.

¹⁸⁷ So Michel, *Le culte des pierres*, 81.

¹⁸⁸ Edward William Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon Part 2* (London; Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1968), 547.

the stones.¹⁸⁹ Considering the longer *zukru* text's description of what seems to be the same place as a "gate" (KÁ),¹⁹⁰ it could be the case that the stones were features of a gate, as pillars or doorposts.¹⁹¹ That would mean the anointing of the stones was tantamount to applying blood and oil to the gate—an act with a cultic parallel from the Hebrew Bible in Ezekiel 45:19, where blood is smeared on the doorposts of the temple in an act of purification, and the Passover narrative in Exodus 12:7, where protection is the primary aim of a similar action. Even so, the question of what lies in the sacred space beyond the stones simply cannot be answered based on the textual accounts.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁹ Arnaud's reading of Emar 373+:174 (his line 179), which specifies passage between the *two* upright stones provided an image that lends itself to the context of doorposts or gate pillars. However, Fleming has shown this reading to be inaccurate (*Time at Emar*, 256). Nowhere in Emar 373+ is the number of upright stones specified.

¹⁹⁰ The common usage of KÁ describes small scale portals, such as courtyard gates, doors to individual buildings, and perhaps doors in the city wall. This is distinct from the use of KÁ.GAL which usually refers to the large gates in the city walls that provide the city's primary points of access. Cf. Lucia Mori, "The City Gates at Emar. Reconsidering the Use of the Sumerograms KÁ.GAL and KÁ in Tablets Found at Meskené Qadime" in *ana turri gimilli: studi dedicati al padre Werner R. Mayer, S.J., da amici e allievi* (ed. M.G. Biga and M. Liverani; Quaderni di Vicino Oriente 5; Rome: Università di Roma La Sapienza, 2010), 251. If an open-air location was envisioned, the *sikkānu*-stones could be part of a kind of *temenos* wall, which could be the extent of the built environment.

¹⁹¹ Cf. Lucia Mori, "The City Gates at Emar" 193.

¹⁹² Considering the description of the place as a "gate" (KÁ) in Emar 373+, A radically different interpretation could follow from Jean-Marie Durand and Lionel Marti's work, which has shown that KÁ is used in some cases in Emar documents to designate "l'endroit où l'on a accès au fleuve," ("Chroniques du Moyen-Euphrate 2," 144) or, as Hervé Reculeau has more recently elaborated, "access to water" derived from any source ["Late Bronze Age Rural Landscapes of the Euphrates according to the Emar Texts" in *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society. Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference, 25.-26.04.2006* (ed. Lorenzo d'Alfonso, Yoram Cohen, and Dietrich Sürenhagen; AOAT 349; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008), 133]. Rainfall averages at the site of Emar place it in "a zone of marginal rain-fed cultivation, where irrigation would be at least used as a complementary water source..." assuming that current rainfall is not significantly at variance with that of the Late Bronze Age (Reculeau, "Late Bronze Age Rural Landscapes," 130). Since no large-scale irrigation systems are known to have existed at the site, it seems that farmers depended on small-scale irrigation practices related to various, nearby access points to water, designated as 'gates' (KÁ). This drew Emar's agricultural countryside into "water districts" that were given unique names and sometimes identified in the sale of land that would depend on them. The names of these districts could be based on the source of the water or a topographical feature associated with it, but are also known to have various other namesakes, such as individual persons or deities (e.g. 'Gate' of Latarak, AuOr S1 98:11; ^dNIN.KUR.RA, RE 21:8 and CM 13 8:6; *et al.*). Given this use of KÁ, one might consider that the "Gate of the *sikkānu*-stones," rather than designating a built structure, could refer instead to a topographical region associated with water. Such a location for cultic stones would comport with the placement of *huwaši*-stones in Hittite ritual practices, which are often near conspicuous features of nature, including rivers. And at least one Emarite ritual indisputably references just such a water 'gate' in the localization of the deity ^dNIN.URTA of the 'Gate' of

To be sure, an understanding that prioritizes the use of *sikkānu*-stones as a protective barrier of sacred space distances itself from an interpretation that would envision the *zukru* festival as describing many, free-standing stones, each erected as a representation of an individual deity. Readers of the *zukru* festival have favored this more elaborate construal, in which each Emarite deity who processes to the *sikkānu*-stones would have had a direct encounter with his/her aniconic representation. Michel speculates that the purpose of this tête-à-tête (or tête-à-pierre, as it were) was to “recharge” the divine essence of the hand-made statue from the (more powerful) representation of the same deity in nature.¹⁹³ Though I doubt the likelihood of such a scenario in the *zukru* ritual, I do not intend to argue against the use of *sikkānu*-stones as individualistic divine representations, altogether. Designations such as “the *sikkānu*-stone of Ḫebat” and “the *sikkānu*-stone of^dNIN.URTA” are most easily, though not necessarily, interpreted as just such representations, and evidence from outside Emar might help to confirm that picture. It may, therefore, be best to conclude that the category of cultic objects known as *sikkānu*-stones were multi-functional. When they are encountered, especially without reference to a particular deity as is the case in the *zukru* festival, we must not simply assume their use as a divine representation but also consider their use as markers and protectors of sacred space, which, after all, is likely to be the source of their utility in

Amita (Emar 446:11-12; cf. also Emar 274:6); the “*Amet* ‘Gate’” is counted among a list of water ‘gates’ in PdA 65. However, no water district by this name is attested in the non-ritual documents from Emar. Since there is no evidence within the ritual text or otherwise to necessitate such an interpretation and the understanding of the festival is in no way enhanced by taking this interpretive position, this position should be considered only an interesting possibility rather than a plausible hypothesis.

¹⁹³ Patrick Michel, “Worshipping Gods and Stones,” in *Mesopotamia in the ancient world: impact, continuities, parallels: proceedings of the Seventh Symposium of the Melammu Project held in Obergurgl, Austria, November 4-8, 2013* (ed. Robert Rollinger and Erik van Dongen; Melammu symposia 7; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2015), 64.

some cases as divine representations—a sacred space unto itself that is inhabitable by a god.

Michel has proposed a close connection between the Hittite cult of *ḫuwaši*-stones and the *sikkānu*-stones at Emar, calling attention to the prevalence of Hittite ritual procedures (including those associated with major festivals such as KILAM and AN.TAḪ.ŠUM) that call for divine statues to process to a location containing one or more standing stones. The Hittite *ḫuwaši*-stones dwelled in “open-air sanctuaries,” which would typically be placed in locations outside of the city that strongly evoked the power of nature: on mountains, beside rivers, or even under trees.¹⁹⁴

But to posit influence of Hittite religious concepts on the *sikkānu*-stones of the *zukru* ritual would certainly be mistaken, despite the titillating correspondences. Emar 375+ is an early form of the *zukru* ritual, pre-dating the direct involvement of the Hittite empire in Emar. The use of the stones in Emar 375+ shows that their presence in Emar was not dependent upon Hittite influence.¹⁹⁵ However, it is possible and even quite likely that the *way* in which activities surrounding the stones were incorporated into the expanded *zukru* festival version was influenced by Hittite ritual forms, as can be observed for the mode of practice of several other ritual elements, as we will explore in Chapter 2. Even in that case, we must be cautious not to allow a Hittite-influenced format to suggest a simple equation of the ritual elements, themselves. *sikkānu*-stones may have existed in

¹⁹⁴ Michel, “Worshipping Gods and Stones,” 59. For a fuller overview, cf. also Tryggve Mettinger, *No Graven Image? Israelite Aniconism in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context* (Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 42; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995), 115-34.

¹⁹⁵ Contra Michel, who takes the use of the upright stones alone to be enough evidence to claim the *zukru* was “Hittitized” [*sic*] (“Worshipping Gods and Stones,” 62). Though, in large part, I share his opinion of Hittite influence on the *zukru*, I view this case more cautiously since the local use upright stones is well established. Michel makes a fuller for Hittite influence in his longer work, *Le culte des pierres*, 220-45.

a shared religious nexus with Hittite *huwaši*-stones, but their actual roles and functions in their respective ritual systems do not seem to have been the same.

Anointing the Stones with Blood and Oil

What is most distinctive about the presence of the *sikkānu*-stones in the *zukru* ritual is the rite to which they are subjected: the stones are treated to anointment with blood and oil. Unction is an altogether common ritual phenomenon; it is rather the combination of anointing substances that is much rarer. Ceremonial anointment with oil alone is a custom so well-known from the ancient Near East that it becomes unnecessary to dwell on specific examples. The overall purpose of the act is to mark a change in status, especially in the legal sense of elevation to a new role with greater rights, privileges, and responsibilities.¹⁹⁶ It is in this tradition that the anointment of kings and priests at their installations takes place, alongside the practice of anointing, for example, a slave who is manumitted.¹⁹⁷ The ceremonialization of status change also offers an explanation for another anointing practice at Emar attested outside of the ritual corpus. In a number of sale contracts, at the conclusion of the transaction, the parties involved enjoy what appears to be a ceremonial meal together. On this occasion, “*hukku*-bread is broken, the table is anointed (*pašiš*) with oil.”¹⁹⁸ Although the oil is poured neither on the property owners nor the property itself, the ritualized daubing of oil on the feast table

¹⁹⁶ Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 553.

¹⁹⁷ See Raymond Westbrook, “Old Babylonian Period” in *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law. Volume I*. (ed. Raymond Westbrook; HdO 72; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 384. For the manumission of a prostitute at Ugarit in the Late Bronze Age, see PRU 3 110:8.

¹⁹⁸ Emar 20:19; 109:18; 110:24; 111:21; 130:17; RE 20:21; 33:21; 70:20

where the deal is concluded¹⁹⁹ symbolizes the transfer of rights and responsibilities that accompany the sale.²⁰⁰

In contrast to oil unction, application of blood is a much less well-attested. Ritualized manipulation of blood (Hittite *ešhar*, Hurrian *zurki*) was a feature of Hittite cultic practice, though I would stress at the outset that it is not the case that Hittite ritual practices have influenced Emarite ritual on this point, since Emar 375+ precedes the involvement of the Hittites in Emarite cult.²⁰¹ Still, the Hittite examples of blood unction are useful phenomenological comparanda. Most of the texts that refer to bloody rites record rituals derived from the Hurrian-influenced region of Kizzuwatna in the Imperial Period. One of these records the establishment of a new temple apparatus for the Night-goddess (CTH 481), in which blood is smeared on all of the new appurtenances: the cultic implements, the new divine image, and the temple itself.²⁰² Similarly, in the Papanikri birth ritual, a blood-smearing rite is prescribed in the event that a birth stool breaks just prior to delivery of the child.²⁰³ The breaking of the stool is seen as more than a case of misfortune, indicating instead that “evil influences” are at work.²⁰⁴ The newly

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Gen 31:44-46, where Jacob and Laban share a meal as a ritual means by which to conclude their land-division agreement. The act is accompanied by the erection of a *maššēbā* as a boundary stone, beside which they eat.

²⁰⁰ A similar procedure is attested in a house sale document from OB Alalakh (AIT 60). See further, Meir Malul, *Studies in Mesopotamian Legal Symbolism*, 346.

²⁰¹ Most commonly the blood rituals in Hurro-Hittite literature are described with the Hittite verb *ešharnumāi*- “to bloody” or the Hurrian term (SISKUR) *zurkiyaš* “blood (rite).” Gary Beckman, “Blood in Hittite Ritual,” *JCS* 63 (2011): 98. Yitzhaq Feder, “A Levantine Tradition: The Kizzuwatnean Blood Rite and the Biblical Sin Offering” in *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbors in Honour of Itamar Singer* (ed. Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan, and Jared Miller; StBoT 51; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 102.

²⁰² KUB 29 4 iv 38-40. See Beckman, “Blood in Hittite Ritual,” 101. The text is can be found in Jared Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), 259-311.

²⁰³ KBo 5 1 (CTH 476). See Rita Strauß, *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 284-309.

²⁰⁴ Beckman, “Blood in Hittite Ritual,” 101.

constructed stools are smeared with blood (obtained from two birds) and meat offerings, complete with cooked fat, are given in front of them.

Gary Beckman suggests that the Hittites' ritual use of blood imparts a "vivifying quality to the objects and locations" that receive it.²⁰⁵ But the need for vivification in any of the objects that receive the blood, apart from the divine statue, is unclear to me.

Indeed, the expressed purpose of the rite, at least in CTH 481, is *purification* of the new cultic artifacts.²⁰⁶ Accordingly, Yitzhaq Feder attributes the collapse of the birth stool in the Papanikri ritual to "divine anger towards the parturient" that must be appeased through atonement.²⁰⁷ Whether or not she is aware of it, the parturient has committed an offense against one of the gods; it is the role of the blood rite to purge her of her offense. In a similar fashion, Feder notes, the blood rite is used in the event that a person is defiled by contact (real or imagined) with restricted foods. The thread that weaves these examples together is the need for ritual purification. Blood is the agent that precipitates it.

Furthermore, the connection of the blood rite to the presentation of meat offerings should be highlighted. The "hybrid Hurrian/Hittite construction *uziya zurkiya šipant-*, 'make a meat and a blood offering,'" ²⁰⁸ is not limited to the Papanikri ritual, but occurs so frequently as to be called a "functional unity" for the purgation of impurity.²⁰⁹ Though they are employed in tandem, the two rites are distinct, retaining their individual names and procedures. For the meat-offering, this involves butchering the sacrificial animal (a sheep, in the case of the Papanikri ritual), cooking its fat and giving the fat as an

²⁰⁵ Beckman, "Blood in Hittite Ritual," 101.

²⁰⁶ KUB 29 4 iv 40.

²⁰⁷ Feder, "A Levantine Tradition," 101.

²⁰⁸ Beckman, "Blood in Hittite Ritual," 98.

²⁰⁹ Feder, "A Levantine Tradition," 105.

offering.²¹⁰ This is not dissimilar from the blood unction in the *zukru* ritual, which tends to be associated with the Glorification Ceremony. That ceremony also involves the slaughter and cooking of a lamb, the fat of which is probably the very same used to anoint the upright stones along with the blood. Like the *zurki*- and *uzi*-offerings, the blood unction and Glorification rites are distinct—indeed the Glorification is performed in many other ritual contexts with no attending unction rites. It is only in the *zukru* festival that the rites are intermingled to produce a compound ritual action.

Better-known examples of ritual blood manipulation are found in the Hebrew Bible.²¹¹ A concern for the proper manipulation of blood is the paramount concern for the *ḥaṭṭā*’t-offering of Lev 4. Two varieties of the procedure are prescribed: one in which blood of the sacrificial animal is sprinkled on the veil of the sanctuary and applied to the horns of the incense altar (vv. 6-7, 17-18) and another in which the blood is daubed on the horns of the altar of the burnt offering (vv. 25, 30). The offering has a purificatory effect (vv. 26, 31) and the blood is the primary detergent.²¹² The same is reflected in Ezek 45:18-19, where blood is applied to the doorposts of the temple in order to purify the sanctuary (*ḥiṭṭē’ṭā* ’et-*hammiqdāš*).

Most notably, the use of blood *and* oil in tandem and as a mixed concoction is also a known feature of the Israelite cult.²¹³ Both variations occur in the ritual complex for the ordination of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood. In the first type, the initiands are consecrated by the pouring (*yāšaq*) of oil (alone) on their heads (Lev 8:10; Exod

²¹⁰ KBo 5 1:28-29.

²¹¹ Daniel Fleming has considered Levantine anointing practices, including those of Emar, in relation to such events in the Hebrew Bible in “The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests,” *JBL* 117 (1998): 401-14.

²¹² On the nature of *ḥaṭṭā*’t as a purification offering, see Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 253-264.

²¹³ Note the connection of the two substances in the context of festival legislation in Exod 23:18: “You shall not offer the blood of my sacrifice upon (or with) leaven, or allow the fat of my festival to linger until morning.”

29:7).²¹⁴ Later, in the course of the required sacrificial offerings, blood of a ram is applied to the initiands' right earlobes, right thumbs, and right big toes—the extremities of their bodies (Lev 8:23-24; Exod 29:20). As Jacob Milgrom has pointed out, this rite parallels Ezekiel's application of blood to the extremities of the temple—its altar, the corners of its ledge (*'āzārā*), and its border (*g^ebûl*)—the purpose of which is explicitly stated to be purification (Ezek 43:20).²¹⁵ Thus, the new priests are first consecrated with oil and subsequently purified with blood.

Following the application of blood to the priests' extremities, blood from the altar and the anointing oil are comingled and the resulting substance is sprinkled on the men and their priestly vestments to consecrate them—the men and their clothes (Lev 8:30; Exod 29:21). Since we have already seen that, in the installation complex, oil consecrates and blood purifies, it is surprising that an admixture of them serves the same purpose as oil, alone. Perhaps each substance preserves its unique function, despite the fact that both are subsumed under the stated purpose of consecration. After all, as Michael Hundley has observed, purity and holiness are concepts that are sometimes blurred due to the fact that they “seem to be part of a single continuum. Once pollutants are removed, the object may be fit for and dedicated to the divine, and therefore described in one word as both pure and holy.”²¹⁶

Although a genetic relationship among the known attestations of blood and oil unction cannot be established with relation to Emar's cult, the comparative examples are

²¹⁴ Lev 8:10 makes explicit that this is an act of consecration, while Exod 29 withholds that terminology until after the application of blood in v. 21.

²¹⁵ Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 528.

²¹⁶ Michael Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle* (FAT 50; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 76.

unified in suggesting that the application of blood to persons or objects is an element of ritual purification. Anointment with oil, on the other hand, marks a change in status. When the anointed party's status involves traversing the border between sacred and profane, the act is one of consecration. In both Hittite and Israelite examples, blood can be mixed or used in tandem with oils and fats, in which case the individual efficacy of each substance seems to retain its integrity. If these data can extend to Emar's ritual system, they suggest that the *zukru*'s anointment with blood and oil, whether mixed or tandem, likewise purifies the *sikkānu*-stones and consecrates them into the sphere of the holy. Their consecration is a symbol of the elevation of these otherwise ordinary-looking stones to sacred objects with divine purpose, which is only possible in a state of ritual purity.

Why the stones must be consecrated and purified in this event is a more difficult question that cannot be answered with certainty. Perhaps, like Ezekiel's purification rite or the annual purification of the Israelite temple on *yom kippur*, which also effectuates purity through blood (Lev 16), it was necessary to renew the ritual state of the *sikkānu*-stones on a periodic basis. Or, since the site of the stones was the primary space for the *zukru*'s ritualization, including the sacrificial rites, their consecration/purification might have been necessary to reinforce the sacrality of the space, and to symbolize this distinction in the eyes of the ritual participants.

Performing the Glorification Ceremonies

Both the shorter *zukru* and the longer, festival version incorporate in their performances a distinct, named ritual complex that is also attested in other Emarite ritual

events: the Glorification Ceremony (*kubbadu*),²¹⁷ which will be discussed here utilizing the evidence of both texts, since there is no discernable change in the ceremony between the versions.²¹⁸ The Glorification Ceremonies are always called simply *kubbadu* in Emar 375+, though when mentioned in Emar 373+ they are further specified as being *kubbadu šeḫru*, the “Minor Glorification Ceremony.”²¹⁹ In the better persevered text of the *zukru* festival, the ceremony always takes place at a threshold—three times at the Central City Gate and once at the Gate of *sikkānu*-stones.²²⁰ The same is probably true for the shorter

²¹⁷ There is a term spelled *ku-ba-dV* that occurs three times in two texts from Emar outside of the ritual corpus (Emar 366:8; 368:1, 8). Both of these texts contain notations concerning distributions (?) of metals to a list of individual recipients. Emar 366 names disbursements of 20-70 units of bronze to seven men, who are referred to in closing as *LÚ^{meš} ku-ba-di*. Emar 368 deals with units of copper under the heading *[UR]UDU^{meš} ša ku-ba-di*, which is then narrowed to *ki-ba-du i-na^{uru} Za-a[t-t]i-ba-ni* mid-list, in line 8. The first half of the text contains only personal names, no specified quantities; the second half specifies quantities for three of six lines. Arnaud grouped these texts in a section entitled “les livraisons cultuelles,” owing to his understanding of *ku-ba-du* in these documents as one and the same as the ritual *ku-ba-du*. But these texts have no other obvious connection to the performance of cult. Their administrative genre and their specific concern with measurements of metals raises suspicion that an interpretation grounded in the basic root meaning “to be heavy” is rather more appropriate. Jean-Marie Durand and Francis Joannes have followed that line, proposing, with reference to the Mari Akkadian term *kubdum* “plumb (bob),” that the word in these texts refers to an “ingot” and the men associated with them to metal workers [*‘kubuddâ’u à Mari et à Emâr*,” *N.A.B.U.* (1990): 53-54 no. 70]. On the other hand, the closing of these administrative texts with a derivative of **kbd* calls to mind the widespread use of the root in Ugaritic economic texts to notate a “full payment” (e.g. KTU³ 4.156:7; 4.169:10). It is not impossible that even here *ku-ba-du* describes individuals whose unit of disbursement is a “paid-in-full” sum.

²¹⁸ The Glorification rite is named twenty-five times (thirty-one, if duplicates are counted) in the Emar ritual corpus in a cluster of seven textual compositions: Emar 369, 373+, 375, 403, 446, 452, and 463. It is likely that the small fragment Emar 403 belongs with one of these other, longer texts, reducing the overall number of compositions attesting the rite to six. Eleven of the individual attestations occur in the *zukru* ritual texts

²¹⁹ The Minor Glorification stands in contrast to the Major Glorification Ceremony (*kubbadu rabû*), which is attested in only two Emar rituals. One is the installation of the NIN.DINGIR, Emar 369A:30; C:10b. The other is the tablet containing rites for the month of Abû, Emar 452:35. In the latter case, the offering list that precedes the mention of the ceremony seems to be constituent of its performance. This list includes a *seah* of barley flour, two *qa* of *šinahilu*, a *ḪA*-vessel, two sheep provided by the king, 1 *ḫizzibu*, and twenty-five *ḫurri*-birds. On a separate day of the month, the Minor Glorification is also given (lines 45-46). Unexpectedly, it contains a lengthier list of offerings, though not comparable on all points, including a *seah* and a *qa* of porridge-bread, a *ḫuppar*, a *maḫḫaru*-vessel each of barley beer and wine, a sheep, a dove, honey, ghee, beef, venison, fish, apricots, sour milk, figs, “all fruits,” and four *ḫurri*-birds. These two offering lists might suggest that the “minor/major” distinction of the Glorification ceremonies may not be determined by the magnitude of their offerings.

²²⁰ Fleming translates the phrase *KÁ.GAL ša qabli* as “The Great Gate of Battle” (based on what is categorized as *qablu* B in CAD), noting that *qablu* A, “middle,” does not usually occur as a stand-alone substantive, but rather in a construct relationship, “the middle of [noun]” (*Time at Emar*, 93 n. 192). But the syntax is probably influenced by the West Semitic local dialect. An example to this effect is found in the Hebrew Bible’s *ša‘ar hattāwek*, literally, “the gate of the middle,” i.e., “the middle gate” (Jer 39:3).

zukru. The ceremony once occurs “between the *sikkānu*-stones,” which probably refers to the same location as Emar 373+’s “Gate of *sikkānu*-stones” and recurs in the a broken line reading, “[Between the *sikkānu*-stones ...] and the city gates they perform the Glorification Ceremonies.”²²¹ This emphasis on threshold locations is not unique to the Glorification Ceremony, itself, but rather is due to the *zukru*’s own focus on liminal locations, where all of the ritual actions take place.²²² In fact, the Glorification Ceremony was a versatile rite that was utilized in various ritual programs in Emar.

In each of three examples, the Minor Glorification Ceremony in the longer *zukru* involves offering materials of a single ewe, two pair of porridge-loaves (*pappāsu*) or thick porridge-loaves (NINDA.KUR₄.RA), and a *huppar* (lines 36, 62, 166). All were provided by the royal institution. The ewe was burned—presumably as a part of the ceremony itself—and the activity was accompanied by feasting. The anointing of the *sikkānu*-stones occurs in close connection with the performances of Glorification Ceremonies, though, as we have seen, constitutes an independent rite. The two are

Moreover, the root **qbl* in Akkadian is attested broadly in adjectival forms to describe city gates; e.g. AOB I 98:7 (KÁ *qa-ab-li-u*), Iraq 17 134 no. 16:19 (KÁ¹ MURUB₄-*ti*). When the divine procession leaves the ‘Gate’ of the Upright Stones and returns to the city, its point of re-entry is the Central City Gate. The designated point of re-entry and performance of sacrificial ritual at the gate show that the return is not simply a practical matter of returning the statues to their temples but rather a ritualized entrance into the city over which the gods preside (cf. pages 259-60). The fortification structures of Emar were not revealed during the French excavations of the site, so we have no clear picture of what the city gates of Emar looked like or where the structure called the “Central City Gate” might have stood. The Emar texts evidence five named city gates and several times reference “the city gate” without any specification of a name. Counting the unnamed gate as a separate entity, Lucia Mori suggests that these six gates correspond to those mentioned in the divine epithet “[the Seven Divine Counselor]s of the Six City Gates” (Emar 373:134) and therefore represent the totality of the city’s main gates (Mori, “City Gates of Emar,” 252-55, noting that the excavated gates at nearby Ekalte number five, which suggests that Emar’s six proposed gates is a reasonable number for the city).

²²¹ Emar 375A:51, 52. Cf. also Emar 375A:41, 42.

²²² A threshold location for the rite is found again in Emar 369, where it seems to have been performed at the entrance to the gate of the courtyard of the temple of ^dIŠKUR, provided that the setting has not changed from that of the shaving ceremony that preceded it (Emar 369:19-10). Emar 452:35, which relates to the cult of the dead, prescribes a *kubbadu* ceremony “at the gate of the tomb.”

closely associated due to the use of the fat of the sacrificial ewe in the anointing of the upright stones, which is only made clear by Emar 373+: 167 + 425:3.

The highly laconic nature of Emar 375+ precludes detailed assessment of its Glorifications, but there is no reason to suppose that they took a significantly different form. What is different from the festival version is that, with one exception, each instance of the rite in the shorter *zukru* text occurs in the plural. Where a verb is preserved, all examples are the object of a cognate accusative expression, *kubbadī kubbudu*, “they perform the Glorification Ceremonies.” This difference may be the result of Emar 375+’s preference to discuss the Glorification Ceremonies all together near the end of the text, rather than describing each one as the timeline of the festival progresses. Although it is difficult to discern from the broken context, the clustering of references to the ceremony on lines 41-42 and 51-52 most likely describe the execution of Glorifications throughout the seven-day *zukru* event.

Although the *zukru* texts offer limited information about the performance of the Glorification Ceremony, some overall observations about it can be pieced together from its appearance in other ritual texts. In the first place, as the variability in its location has already suggested, the rite is not dependent upon any singular fixed place, or even upon the location of its performance being a specifically cultic place. One infers from this also that no non-transportable implements (such as fixed altars) are required for the ritual’s performance, unless those implements are already permanent fixtures at each location. This movability demonstrates a certain fluidity in the Emarite conception of sacred space and could go so far as to suggest a reason for the consecration of the *sikkānu*-stones, if such was needed to reinforce the sacrality of the space for this ritual practice.

The Glorification Ceremony was a sacrificial rite. The sacrificial character is made clearest in Emar 452 with the enumeration of offering materials and with the statement “they will offer (i.e. sacrifice) the Minor Glorification Ceremonies” (*kubbadi šehrī...inaqqû*, line 45). In Emar 373+, the *kubbadu* is always bound up with the slaughter and burning of a ewe.

The ceremony was not reserved only for the sake of the gods. In Emar 452:35, it is performed “in front of the gate of the tomb” with no reference to any deity, at all. In line 45 of that text, it is for the *abû* of Dagan’s temple. Several times, it is performed “in front of” a deity, though without specification that it is to the benefit of that deity.²²³ Only once is the Glorification offered directly to a specified recipient, and in that case, which is in the *zukru* festival, it is to “all the gods” as a whole.²²⁴

There does not seem to be any one particular purpose in performing the Glorification Ceremony as opposed to any other ritual action. This rite was simply one appropriate way to ritualize important cultic occasions when sacrificial offerings were required. It was apparently a phenomenon with deep local roots, as its performance is documented diachronically in the ritual corpus. Its appearance in many, unrelated ritual contexts gives the impression of a rite that is truly characteristic of Emarite ritual, providing a cohesiveness to the ritual practices of the region.

As a proper noun designating the distinct actions constituting a sacrificial rite, the word *kubbadu* is descriptive of the perceived character of the event, which I have attempted to evoke with the translation of “Glorification.” Fundamentally, the common Semitic root *kbd/t* conveys the idea of “being heavy,” which is used metaphorically in the

²²³ Emar 369:9 (A, C); 373+:172; 375A:40 = C:9.

²²⁴ Emar 373+:36.

D-stem to describe the act of “honoring.”²²⁵ It is in that stem that Emar’s *ku-ba-du* finds its meaning as a verbal noun formed from *kubbudu*.²²⁶ The word seems to preserve a West Semitic vocalization of the D infinitive (cf. Ugaritic *quttalu*), which is not surprising if the ceremony is distinctively local or regional.²²⁷ The overall description of the rite as one of “glorification” is in keeping with the observation that the event was generally applicable to the ritualization of any important cultic occasion in the religious life of the city. It provided the aspect of glory due the event it ceremonialized.²²⁸

²²⁵ Cf. the use of the root in verbal formations in 375A:41, 52 (=C18); 375C:17; 446:55, 96.

²²⁶ The term could also be a rare *qutāl* nominal pattern, most commonly known in Akkadian for substantives of II-’aleph roots (e.g. *ru’āmu*, “seductiveness,” *šu’āru*, “dance”), though also found in certain substantivized adjectives (*rubā’u*, “prince”), diminutives (*puhādu*, “lamb”), and illnesses (*lubātu*, “(a disease).” Fritz Rudolph Kraus, “Ein Sittenkanon in Omenform” *ZA* 43 (1939):111-12; and, more recently, Fox, *Semitic Noun Patterns*, 229-30. A number of nouns in biblical Hebrew attest this pattern (> *q^ētōl*) with no resemblance in meaning to the categories mentioned for Akkadian *qutāl* (e.g. *b^ērōš*, “juniper,” *r^ēhōb*, “plaza”), which could suggest the pattern was more widely utilized in West Semitic dialects. This form would link the word to standard Akkadian *kubātu*, “honors,” which is attested in first-millennium dialects. Cf. esp. van Driel, *Cult of Assur*, 98 ix 24-26. Cf. esp. pp. 115-116 for the term’s use in ritual context, though the section is grammatically challenging.

²²⁷ John Huehnergard is credited with this observation via personal communication to Fleming in *Installation*, 168 n.291. Huehnergard’s 1988 paper presented before the American Oriental Society is also cited by Penttinen as advocating a D-stem infinitive for *ku-ba-du*. Penttinen adopts this position in his own work, *West Semitic Vocabulary*, 107. I arrived at the same interpretation independent of those works. Other D-stem infinitives in Emar Akkadian take the standard MB form *quttulu* or the Assyrian-looking *qattulu* (cf. Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 381). It is precisely this lack of correspondence to other attested D infinitives that compels Fleming to refrain from this interpretation. He also points out that the orthography of the word never makes a geminated medial radicle explicit (*Installation*, 168 n. 291). Indeed, one implication of reading *kubbadu* would be that neither of the normally attested infinitival forms corresponds to that of Emar’s indigenous, West Semitic dialect, which shines through here. For a further discussion of variant infinitive morphologies at Emar, see Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 381-82.

²²⁸ It should not escape notice that biblical Hebrew *kābōd* (<**kabād*), “heaviness, glory,” also substantivizes the root with applicability to physical burden, financial wealth, and theological gravitas. *kābōd* in the bible may be “given” (*nātan*), “done” (*‘āsā*), placed (*śim*), or be the object any number of other verbal actions, though it never appears to indicate the performance of an activity directed to the god. In one instance, however—2 Chron 32:33—it seems that a performative quality may be intended when the recipient of honor is the recently deceased king. The monarch in this case is Hezekiah, upon whose death and burial at the ascent of the Davidides’ tombs it is said, “All of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem did honor to him” (*w^ēkābōd ‘āsū lō*). The text does not give the impression that a technical, ritual performance is prescribed here, but the example does seem to show that “doing honor” is an activity appropriate to funerary activities. This calls to mind Emar 452, a text relating to performance of the cult of the dead, which prescribes the *kubbadu* ceremony “at the gate of the tomb” (line 35).

Donations to the Gods

Although no explicit references to the slaughter of animals exist in the preserved text, there can be no doubt that the shorter *zukru* ritual was a sacrificial event. In the first place, the isolated references to livestock in the text—some even placing them in a processional order with Dagan—would have no clear purpose if not serving as sacrificial victims. But, more to the point, the three occurrences of the verb *pādu*, “restrain” (lines 3, 11, 21)—an action that is only employed in sacrificial contexts and probably includes within its range of signification in Emar ritual the idea of “restraining *and* offering as sacrifice”—show clearly that at least some bloody sacrifice would have taken place.²²⁹ Still, the quantity of animals slaughtered for the event pales in comparison to the almost unfathomable animal inventory of Emar 373+. No more than one lamb, three sheep (of unspecified maturity), and one calf can be counted in these ritual instructions. The recipients of these offerings include only Dagan and possibly the *sikkānu*-stone of ^dNIN.URTA.

No specific, non-animal foodstuffs for donation to the gods are mentioned; the only reference to bread and beer (line 27) is intended for human consumption. But the use of the blanket term *mākālu*, “food offering,” in line 33 as part of a prescription to return certain ritual goods to the city indicates that some offerings of cereals or other foodstuffs would have been given during the event, as “meat” and “wine” were already specified (line 32). The distribution of such offerings may be the focus of the mostly-lost lines 25-26, where something is placed in *makaltu*-bowls near the *sikkānu*-stone of ^dNIN.URTA.

²²⁹ The verb *naqû*/SISKUR, which is ubiquitous in Emar 373, seems not to have been typical of the earlier, Conventional Format ritual texts. In Emar 446, the verbs associated with sacrifice are *nakāsu*, which is used once elsewhere in the Free Format ritual texts (Emar 385:29 = *ASJ* 14 49:5), *ṭabāhu*, and *pādu*.

In sum, though there is very little that can be said about the nature of the donations to the gods in Emar 375+, it is clear that offerings of various types occurred during the ritual event that were not included in the textual account of the ritual's performance.

Politics and Food: Feasting in the zukru Ritual

An alternate aspect of food usage in the *zukru* ritual is the communal feasting that took place on the 15th and 21st days of the month, after the divine procession and anointing of the *sikkānu*-stones. Despite a total lack of details concerning the festal meals, the fact that feasting occurs is a telling aspect of the ritual's impact. Feasting events are important means of constructing and maintaining political hierarchies and social relationships. As Michael Dietler has pointed out, feasting is an inherently political activity, based on a "trope of commensality" that is underlain with social competition. It is a type of gift exchange, which establishes an obligation of reciprocity for the recipients. But unlike other gift exchanges

food is destroyed in the act of commensal consumption at a feast, and destroyed by ingesting it into the body. This is a very literal embodiment of the gift and the social debt that it engenders. Aside from the powerful symbolic dimension of this practice, it also results in the pragmatic fact that, unlike durable valuables, the food consumed cannot be recirculated (or 'reinvested') in other gift-exchange relationships: food must be produced anew through agricultural and culinary labour in order to fulfil reciprocal obligations.²³⁰

As long as the obligation of reciprocity goes unfulfilled, the original host remains in a socially superior position to the recipient(s), which adds the perception of power to the host and amounts to active construction of the socio-political relationship.

²³⁰ Michael Dietler, "Feasting and Fasting," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion* (ed. Timothy Insoll; Oxford: University Press, 2012), 183.

In this light, it becomes significant that the entire citizenry of Emar participates in the *zukru* feasts.²³¹ The relationship dynamic affected by the feast is, on one side, that of the townsmen and, on the other, is the host of the feast, who is never explicitly named. Unlike the festival text, which specifies in great detail the sources of financial support for the event, Emar 375+ is reticent about its funding. But, since there is no overarching benefactor, such as the king in Emar 373+, and since the event is, after all, given by “the city,” then the city—which is to say, the collective city government—is the host of the feast. City funding for the event could also be the implication of the mostly broken final line of the A-text, which notes a payment from the city. The fact that a preterite verb is used to designate that action implies that it is not a ritual prescription, which would occur in the present tense, but rather a practical, administrative notation that would name the financier.

As events hosted by the collective city government, the *zukru* feasts demonstrate an exercise of power by that institution, which is not surprising considering the prominent place of the city council in Emar’s legal traditions. What is especially notable, however, is the absence of a royal figure in this city-wide festival. It is unlikely that a strong monarch would have voluntarily declined participation in this important social engagement, which implies rather that the *zukru* of Emar 375+ envisions a socio-political context in which a king is not a formidable force. Such a context is fitting for most of Emar’s documented history prior to the 13th century reign of the king Pilsu-Dagan, when

²³¹ The prescriptions, as usual, are cast in the impersonal third person, but the reference to action performed by “townsmen and chiefs of the city” in line 35 suggests a merism for all-inclusive participation in the festival activities. This is underscored by the expressed subject for the feasts in Emar 373+ as UN^{mes}, “the people.”

power of the monarchy increased, and suggests a setting for this ritual text's composition in that earlier period.

Emar 375+: Two Interconnected Rituals?

Although the great majority of the text of Emar 375+ describes events that are clearly a part of *zukru* practice, the focus seems to shift near the very end of the text at line A45 // C12. Text C introduces the new topic with the difficult phrase “*i¹-na ITI.KÁM^dEN bi-ta-ri [...]*.” According to the only two other examples of “*ina ITI.KÁM,*” both in Free Format texts, the phrase should simply introduce the name of a month [e.g. “in the month of (Month Name)”].²³² If the line is to be interpreted as such, it would mean that “*dEN bi-ta-ri*” would be the designation of a separate month. The difficulty with this interpretation is that no such month name is known anywhere in the corpus of Emar texts.

Moreover, the figure of *dEN bi-ta-ri* is enigmatic; only speculation about his identity is possible.²³³ Eugene Pentuic relates the form to a lexical text entry, “AN.KUD / *bi-it-ru ša šá-[me-e]*,” which he interprets to mean “the sluice of the sky” based on the West Semitic usage of the root **btr*.²³⁴ He goes so far as to suggest that Emar 375C:12 should be restored to add “*šá-me-e*” to reflect that title.²³⁵ A deity who controls the “sluices of the sky” (i.e. the mechanisms through which rain is allowed to fall) would be

²³² Emar 28:23 (*i-na ITI.KÁM ša Ta-aš-ri-ti*); AuOrS 1 49:19 (*i-na ITI.KÁM^dNIN.URTA*). The latter example's use of the archaic month name, *dNIN.URTA*, is unexpected, considering the tablet's inscription in the Free Format.

²³³ Juan Marín reads the word as an otherwise unattested GN, *Bīt-ari*, though the orthography of the term makes this unlikely (RGTC 12.2, 57).

²³⁴ Emar 567:5; Pentuic, *West Semitic Vocabulary*, 40.

²³⁵ Since ŠÁ is not able to fit the remaining traces of three horizontals and since the phrase in Emar 567 reads DN *ša šamê* rather than DN *šamê*, we must conclude that Pentuic intends to restore “*dEN bi-ta-ri š[a šá-me-e]*” here.

a reference to the storm-god, making the name an alternate designation of Ba‘lu Ḥalab (the “Lord of Aleppo,” line C14), since that title certainly refers to the storm-god, whose seat of worship is Aleppo.

If that equation were correct, then ^dEN *bi-ta-ri* could introduce a new month in the text, equivalent with the month Ba‘lu (^dEN) Ḥalab known from private documents in the Conventional Format.²³⁶ And, indeed, the figure of Ba‘lu Ḥalab, himself, appears in Emar 375C only two lines later, unless it is rather the month name designated here also, with the ITI sign lost in the preceding lacuna. In either case, the repetition of the reference to what would be the same god or month named for the god by variant titles, one of which is never elsewhere attested, is problematic. It is not in the nature of a ritual text to offer literary variation; rather clear and concise designations are favored.²³⁷ Moreover, the month of Ba‘lu Ḥalab is not at all near to the first month, Zarātu, in which all of the *zukru* activities took place (with the possible addition of actions in the second month, ^dNIN.KUR), so the reason for its placement on the tablet with the first month *zukru* rites would be entirely obscure.²³⁸

Since the introduction of a month with ITI.KÁM would, at any rate, be a non-standard dating formulae—Text C, itself, uses simply “*i-na* ITI (Month Name)” to identify the month of Zarātu in line 3—it may be best to translate *ad sensum*, with Fleming, “during the same month.”²³⁹ In this case, both ^dEN *bi-ta-ri* and Ba‘lu Ḥalab are

²³⁶ Cf. AuOrS 1 15:28, 87:35; RE 71:35; Fs Kutscher 6:44; CM 13 4:35.

²³⁷ That is not to say that complete consistency in terminology applies, but variation usually appears as organic variation among corresponding or synonymous designations. With no outside evidence that *bi-ta-ri* was an alternate designation of Ba‘lu Ḥalab, the proposition of simple scribal variation cannot be sustained.

²³⁸ Fleming has suggested a possible place for the month of Ba‘lu Ḥalab as month VII in the calendar (*Time at Emar*, 206). If so, it would represent the spring axis of the year, perhaps in a foil to Zarātu’s place as the fall axis. However, no other indications in *zukru* materials or, indeed, any other ritual texts implicate the involvement of this month.

²³⁹ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 265.

not representative of month names, but rather invoked for some special attention within the *zukru* complex. As aspects of the storm god, these figures would be naturally important to the fertility of the agricultural undertaking, which the *zukru* ritualizes, making their inclusion in *zukru* events less than surprising.

The day mentioned in line 45 seems to be a prelude to a set of ritual actions that will occur on the 16th—a day that is not known to be significant for *zukru* practice. This involves the preparation of some wood specimens, tamarisk (^{gišr}ŠINIG⁷¹) and poplar (*šarbatu*), for unspecified usages. Poplar is not attested as a ritual material elsewhere in the Emar texts, though the religious significance of that tree is made evident by the divine name Aštar-šarba,²⁴⁰ which is known from both ritual and non-ritual documents.²⁴¹ Both of the ritual occasions in which Aštar-šarba is known to participate also occur on the 16th day of the month, though in those cases the month is Marzaḥānu (Emar 446) = Abû (Emar 452). Since the text continues to reference themes associated with planting (e.g. plowing the land, line C15), it is unlikely that the timeframe has moved to the winter month of Marzaḥānu/Abû. Rather, the god may be seen to have a special association with the date of the 16th, just as Šaggar has a natural association with the 15th due to the emergence of the full moon, and thus the rites associated with his namesake, the poplar tree, are executed on that day in the Emar 375+ complex.

²⁴⁰ A goddess Ištar-šarabat is also known from Bronze Age Syria at Ebla and Mari; cf. Juan Oliva, “Aštar šarbat in Ebla,” *N.A.B.U.* (1993): 32-34. The element *šarbu* in other divine names (e.g. *Bēl šarbi*) is known also in Middle Assyrian texts, where *šarbu* is equivalent in meaning to its feminine counterpart, though reserved for use in divine names.

²⁴¹ Emar 300:4, 446: 87, 89; 452:21; *ASJ* 12 3:6. Probably also the mostly broken Emar 274:18. Arnaud misrecognized the DN in each of its instances. In Emar 300:4 Arnaud reconstructs the broken text as “[^dIš-]tar Za-ar-ma,” though that DN should be written *Išg-tár*, as in the preceding line. A better restoration is [...^dAš-]tar ša-ar-ba[...]), since Aštar’s name is regularly written with the TAR sign. In Emar 446 and 452, he reads SILA.LÍM *ar-ba* “la rue du silo.” See J.A. Belmonte Marín, “Zur Lesung und Deutung von *ina sila.lím ar-ba* in Emar-Texten” *N.A.B.U.* (1997): 82-83.

It is thus clear that the text shows some interest in rites that are not explicitly related to the *zukru*. But the text never completely abandons discussion of *zukru*-looking activities, such as the performance of Glorification ceremonies between the *sikkānu*-stones (line 52). Most importantly, we must recall that the heading of the text explicitly identifies the tablet at hand as a document that deals with rites for the *zukru* ritual, obviating the notion that the *zukru* is only one of several calendrical events mentioned in the text. It appears that the seven-day *zukru* ritual has absorbed the concurrent rites that may be more properly associated with Aštar-šarba and with aspects of the storm-god, if those are separate ritual undertakings. Because of the overlap in the timeframe of their performances, the separate rituals became so closely associated as to be all subsumed under the rubric of the *zukru*. Precisely the same phenomenon occurred in the long Eštar festival of Mari, during which the festival of Nergal's Wagon also takes place.²⁴² To the chagrin of ritual specialists who sought to keep the two distinct, going to far as to change the date of the latter to avoid the problem, the rituals were inseparably linked in practice.²⁴³ Since the link to the rites of the 16th is not evident in the longer *zukru* festival tablet, it seems that the two were either successfully separated in Emarite practice eventually, or simply kept separate in the literature of the updated festival version.

The Interval Between Shorter zukru Performances

The ambiguity of the interval between performances of the *zukru* ritual recorded in Emar 375+ has already been indicated: there is nothing in the preserved text to clarify

²⁴² See Jean-Marie Durand and Michaël Guichard, "Les rituels de Mari" in *Recueil d'études à la mémoire de Marie-Thérèse Barrelet* (ed. Dominique Charpin and Jean-Marie Durand; Mémoires de *N.A.B.U.* 3; FM 3; Paris: SEPOA, 1997), 29, 31.

²⁴³ Cf. ARM 5 25.

the cycle of the ritual's performance. Fleming takes the text's declination to specify any interval as indicating annual observation.²⁴⁴ I have adopted that position in this work, as well, though the possibility that the ritual operated on a different cycle must at least be mentioned. Emar 373+ differs from 375+ by stating its septennial interval explicitly, mostly for the purpose of distinguishing between rites for the *zukru* year and those for the year that preceded it. Yet the entire left edge of the main tablet of Emar 375+ is entirely lost and, with it, the text of the date formulae that would have been inscribed there. It is possible that 6th and 7th year dates could have been specified in those locations. The possibility that ^dNIN.KUR in the text could represent a month name (month II) rather than the goddess, herself, has already been mentioned. If that possibility turned out to be correct, then a multi-year format would be necessary for Emar 375+, since the second month of the year can only be ritualized as part of the *zukru* in a year preceding the main event.

But even lacking a multi-year format in Emar 375+, it is still possible that a different interval could have been used for the *zukru* cycle. The ritual practitioners may not have perceived a need to specify an interval in the text; they simply consulted and copied the instructional tablet when the occasion of the ritual's performance came about. Other rituals that lack a specification of interval are known not to have occurred on an annual basis. Those periodic rituals are introduced in the same way as Emar 375+:

²⁴⁴ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 98, 141-42, 152-54. This position has been accepted by most subsequent scholars who have dealt with texts, including Yamada ["The *zukru* Festival in Emar: On Royal Cooperation with the City," *Orient* 45 (2010), e.g. 113], Rutz (*Bodies of Knowledge*, e.g. 148-49), and Michel (*Le culte des pierres*, e.g. 74).

“When the Emarites perform/give [Ritual Name] ...”²⁴⁵ The timing of the ritual is sometimes understood, rather than specified.²⁴⁶

The foregoing considerations aside, lacking further evidence, the annual interpretation is still the simplest, given that the ritual is integrally tied to the calendar year and the season of planting. Further support of the annual interpretation is found in comparison with Emar 446, a six-month ritual calendar, the annual nature of which need not be doubted. This text begins with the first month of the year, identified by Fleming as Zarātu for the calendar reflected in the document. Although half of the tablet’s obverse side is totally destroyed, it appears that the entirety of that side and about a quarter of the text of the reverse side were dedicated to rites of the month of Zarātu. Starting in line 8, the focus is oriented to rites for the 15th of Zarātu, which, Fleming suggests, “appears to treat rites affiliated with the *zukru*.”²⁴⁷ Beyond the month/day correspondence, the text also witnesses the primary involvement of Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA, procession of those deities along with the god’s axe, “restraint” of lambs (*padû*), and feasting—all of which are known elements of at least one version of *zukru* practice. Taken together, these features could be taken to suggest the practice of a *zukru* ritual, though I would emphasize that none of them are unique to the *zukru* context. When attention is turned towards truly distinctive *zukru* features, Emar 446 is silent. For instance, there is no mention of a veiling rite, no indication that the processions leave the city confines, no

²⁴⁵ See Table 7, page 161 for the introductory formulae.

²⁴⁶ It is also possible that the more archaic form of the *zukru* did not operate on a cyclical basis, at all, but rather was performed only when a need was perceived. This would agree with the evidence for the *zukurum* from Mari, derived from a letter requesting the performance of a *zukurum* for Addu. That such a request needed to be made implies that the ritual did not occur there on a fixed basis. For Emar, since the septennial format is well-known from the longer *zukru* text, which is a more proximal comparison, I prefer to read that format in Emar 375+.

²⁴⁷ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 152.

ritualized re-entry into the city, no mention of the *zukru*'s important seventh day, and no reference to the *sikkānu*-stones, which are ubiquitous in the proper *zukru* texts. Above all, Emar 446 never identifies the rites it records for the 15th of Zarātu as “*zukru*,” despite a clear opportunity in the preserved text to do so (line 8), as it does for other named rites in the text (e.g. *bukkarātu*, line 86). Hence the evidence does not clearly favor the events of the 15th of Zarātu in Emar 446 as belonging to *zukru* practice.

Rather than identify the rites for the 15th of Zarātu as *zukru* in Emar 446, considering the truly archaic nature of that text, it is better to view them as preexisting calendrical rites that helped to give the *zukru* ritual its shape as it developed into the ritual complex recorded in Emar 375+ and, eventually, 373+. Whenever the *zukru* ritual was developed into the state in which we know it, with its fixed dates at the head of the year, it seems to have utilized ritual forms that were already in practice for those dates, no doubt related to the ritualization of the full moon's first appearance.²⁴⁸ The *zukru* ritual accumulated such underlying rites and incorporated them into its own system of unique activities. Hence, if the earlier *zukru* forms took shape in the company of calendrical rites of Zarātu that were practiced annually, then it stands to reason that the *zukru* maintained that annual cycle.

Copying Rituals

The parallel copies of Emar 375+ apparently represent separate performances of the same ritual event. Fleming has shown this rationale to be true of the NIN.DINGIR installation festival. The three copies of that text are, in almost all aspects, identical—

²⁴⁸ Cf. Emar 446:45.

such that they certainly derive from a common source. But changes to certain details of content, such as the variant ritual payment to the diviner (Emar 369:43) and the inclusion of the title “king of Šatappu” in the feasting event (lines 55-56), show that each text also records details unique to the performance that it witnesses. So, while the texts follow a fixed exemplar, there is room also for customized content that corresponds to actual practice.²⁴⁹

The fragmentary state of the Free Format copies of Emar 375+ does not afford us the knowledge of whether individual details about the actual practice of the ritual varied. But we now know that Emarite ritual texts in at least some cases were reproduced for each performance of the ritual event, which not only provides a precedent and reasonable explanation for the copying of the shorter *zukru*, but also suggests a mechanism for explaining the transition in scribal format. The *zukru* is an archaic ritual, the first recording of which occurred in the only scribal format available at the time, the Conventional format. But the continuance of the festival’s practice witnessed a change in the administration of cult at Emar, which was accompanied by the emergence of a different scribal stream—the Free Format. Because the cultic administrators, the Diviners, worked in the Free Format exclusively, the necessary textual reproductions adopted that form going forward. The details of these crucial changes in Emarite politics form the focus of the second part of this book.

²⁴⁹ See Fleming, “Emar’s *entu* Installation: Revising Ritual and Text Together.”

CHAPTER 3
THE *ZUKRU* FESTIVAL:
EXPANSION OF LOCAL TRADITIONS

The *zukru* was a ritual with multiple expressions in ancient Emar. Although it is clear from the almost exclusive participation of Dagan in the event and the apparent involvement of the whole city population that the *zukru* was an august rite, nothing about the descriptions offered in Emar 375+ suggests a particularly elaborate procedure. The same is by no means true of the longer version of the *zukru* recorded in Emar 373+. That text contains lengthy descriptions of an event that is steeped in extravagance. Nothing else in Emar's ritual corpus suggests an event that could rival the *zukru* in wealth and prestige. A staggering number of animals were slaughtered as sacrifices during the event and dedicated to each of the more than one hundred deities mentioned by name in the text. Preparatory rituals began in anticipation of the main events an entire year in advance, with subsidiary rituals occurring on three days over the course of two months in the prior year. This version of the *zukru* ritual was called a festival (EZEN)—a designation that did not apply to the shorter *zukru* of Emar 375+.

Despite the elaborate trappings, the festival version of the *zukru* is easily identifiable with its shorter counterpart. Although each version contains its own unique elements, the two share fundamental features of calendar, divinity, itinerary, and actions. The *zukru* festival of Emar 373+ is an elaboration of the more concise and modest event depicted in Emar 375+.

The *zukru* festival text has experienced a gradual accrual of material since its initial publication. Already in the *editio princeps*, Arnaud had surmised that Emar 376 was a part of the *zukru* complex, asserting that it does not connect to the main tablet and so labeling it as a duplicate of 373.¹ Daniel Fleming showed that assertion to be incorrect when he joined Emar 376 to the top of the obverse of the main *zukru* festival tablet in the early 1990s.² More accurately, Arnaud recognized that Emar 374 does belong to the bottom of the reverse of Emar 373, but because it cannot be joined directly to that tablet, he chose to separate the material and give it a separate publication number.³ Consequently, Fleming excluded it from his own edition of the text, although he recognized its relatedness.⁴ Matthew Rutz has correctly noted that the reference in that fragment to Dagan as *bēl bukkari* is indicative of *zukru* material.⁵ Indeed, Dagan is never mentioned with this title in any non-*zukru* context. Additionally in defense of the inclusion of Emar 374 with 373 we may note (1) the double middle ruling between the columns, which is rare in any ritual texts, (2) the indistinguishable script and orthography of the texts, (3) the findspot of Emar 374 alongside 373 (note the sequential excavation numbers Msk 74292d and 74292a, respectively), and finally (4) the shared thematic

¹ Arnaud, Emar VI.3, 371. Arnaud's numbering scheme in his publication of the tablets draws together all of Emar 373-377 as *zukru*-related materials.

² For a revised drawing of the tablet with Emar 376 incorporated, see Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 294.

³ See Arnaud's notes regarding the placement of Emar 374, Emar VI.3, 365, 368. Matthew Rutz has recently "tentatively assign[ed] this piece to the bottom of columns iii and iv on the reverse of" Emar 373, apparently not recognizing that Arnaud had already placed it just so (*Bodies of Knowledge*, 148). That placement should be considered certain, since no other location on the tablet could physically accommodate the fragment.

⁴ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 99.

⁵ Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 148-49.

elements such as activity “between the *sikkānu*-stones,” reference to “the return” (*tūrtu*), and anointing with blood and oil.

The addition of Emar 374 to the main text of the festival, which offers thirteen partial lines to Column III and eight partial lines to Column IV, has an estimable impact on the understanding of this ritual text, even as its broken state prevents the emergence of many new details. The text it contains shows that after the enumeration of the long, hierarchical god-list of Columns II and III, Part I of the text proceeds with its narration of the festival days, recounting events for what is sure to be the seventh day of the festival (the 21st of SAG.MU). It is both illuminating and frustrating that the text seems to display a different focus in this section than what the reader of Emar 373, by itself, expects. Part I is dedicated mostly to sacrificial offerings, recounting very few ritual actions, but the addition of Emar 374 shows that a more action-oriented focus did belong to Part I, at least in its discussion of the festival’s final day. Other unique and obscure elements in the fragment serve to remind the reader that this otherwise formulaic ritual text is not so predictable as it seems.

Fleming also identified two small fragments, Emar 424 and 425, as “related” to the *zukru* texts, though he offered no specificity as to the nature of that relationship.⁶ Here, I suggest the direct join of Emar 425 (Msk 74289d) to column IV of Emar 373+. Since, according to Arnaud, Emar 424 and 425 derive from the same tablet, the suggested join of Emar 425 to 373+ has the effect of confirming that 424 also belongs to that text.⁷ I have found a likely place for its inclusion at the top of Column II, joining indirectly to the lines already added in this column by the direct join of Emar 376. These lines,

⁶ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 99. So also, Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 148.

⁷ Arnaud, Emar VI., 410.

fragmentary as they are, demonstrate a thematic unity and, for at least one line, provide the text that would be expected in the break of the main tablet through comparison to similar wording elsewhere in the text. I have chosen, with caution, to include both Emar 424 and 425 in this edition, though their placements can only be considered tentative until collation is possible.

Although the inclusion of new material in the text edition necessarily alters the number and order of lines, further emending the lineation of the *editio princeps* is out of the question, since this has already occurred once by Fleming. Continual meddling with the text's enumeration would threaten to make discussion of it cumbersome and confusing. Instead, I preserve Fleming's more recent numbering scheme, while adding additional material with its own *Emar VI.3* text and line number. Therefore, lines 162 and 163, for example, are interrupted by lines numbered "374:1," "374:2," and so forth.

Finally, a prefatory word about the production of this text edition is required. Because access to the tablets in the Aleppo National Museum was prohibited by civil war at the time the work was undertaken, my edition of the texts is not based on collation. Arnaud's tablet drawings in Emar VI.1-2 served as the primary basis for reading, which was supplemented by Fleming's extensive body of published notes drawn from his collation of the texts.⁸ These, for the most part, are short, corrective illustrations that clarify Arnaud's drawing, though complete drawings of Emar 376 (Msk 74297c) and 428 (Msk 74287b) are also included (294-95). My reading additionally benefited from Fleming's unpublished collation notes, which he generously provided for me.

⁸ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 294-311.

Table 4. *Excavation Data for Emar 373+ Textual Components*

Excavation No.	Note	Findspot	Locus
Msk 74292a	main tablet	M ₁ M I SW – I SE	3 (, 9)
Msk 74132 ⁹	join to main tablet	M ₁ M III SE (?)	1 (, 4, 43)
Msk 74290d	direct join	M ₁ M I SW – I SE	3 (, 9)
Msk 74304a	direct join	M ₁ M I SW – I SE	3 (, 9)
Msk 74292d	= Emar 374; indirect join	M ₁ M I SW – I SE	3 (, 9)
Msk 74297c	= Emar 376; direct join	M ₁ M I SW	3, 1
Msk 74290c	indirect join	M ₁ M I SW – I SE	3 (, 9)
Msk 74289c	= Emar 424; indirect join	M ₁ M I SW	3, 1
Msk 74289d	= Emar 425; possible direct join	M ₁ M I SW	3, 1

Even with these many reliable resources, undertaking a new reading without collation raises challenges. As a method for this work, I have adopted a principle of verification. That is to say, even where the previous readers indicated in their transliterations certain traces or partial readings, I did not take the liberty of including them in this text unless I was able to set my eyes on the traces, however faint, in one of the sources listed above.¹⁰

⁹ Arnaud joined Msk 74132 to 74292a in his primary edition of the texts and offered the tablet's drawing with the two already integrated in Column IV. The precise boundaries of this fragment are therefore difficult to delineate in the copy. Emar VI.2, 136-40 offers copies of textual fragments assigned the excavation numbers Msk 74132a-v. This object, which bears the same excavation number but lacking any alphabetic designation, does not occur again with those fragments.

¹⁰ On some occasions I have accepted the reading proposed by the editors in such cases, though I have marked it as fully reconstructed, rather than partially. Especially, when it comes to the representation of visible traces near lacunae, it must be borne in mind that Fleming's eyes were on the tablet, itself, when he made his decisions about the reading.

Column I

{5-7 lines missing (Fleming)}

1. [17 signs + 1 BÁN^{ninda} *pa-*] *pa-sú* ʿ4¹ BÁN N[INDA.ŠE 4^{dug}PIḪÙ *a-na* UN^{meš}]
2. [1 BÁN 1 QA^{ninda} *pa-pa-sú* 1 QA NINDA.ŠE 1^{dug}ḪA 1^{dug}KUR₄.K]UR₄ *ša* LUGAL *a-na* ^dKUR
3. [SISKUR-*u* 1 BÁN 1 QA^{ninda} *pa-pa-sà* 1 QA NINDA.ŠE 1^{dug}ḪA *ša* É DINGIR-*lì* *a-na* *pa-n*] ^di^dKUR
4. [SISKUR-*u* 16 signs *i-n*] *a*[?]-*ša-ru-šu-nu-ti*

5. [8 signs] x x [*i-na* MU.6.KÁM *i-na* ITI] ʿSAG¹.MU UD.25.KÁM
6. [8 signs] ʿx¹ TA[?] [6 signs] ʿx¹ 20[?] KÁM z[*u*[?]-(x)]-ʿx¹-*nu*
7. [6 signs #] SILA₄ KÙ.G[A^{meš} *a-na* DINGIR^{meš} *gáb*]-ʿbi¹ kur *E-ma*[*r i-pa-a-du*(?)]
8. [7 signs] *qu šu* [4 signs *iš*]-ʿtu¹ ŠÀ-*šu la-a* [K]Ù.G[A(?) 2 signs]
9. [7 signs] ʿx¹ *i-na-az-z*[*a-lu*(?)]

10. [*i-na* ITI *Ni-qa-li*] *i-na* UD.24.KÁ[M #] BÁN NINDA.ŠE 2^{dug}PIḪÙ
11. [7 signs] *ša* LUGAL *a-na* *gáb-bi* DINGIR^{meš} *ú-za-a-zu*
12. [1 UDU *a-na* ^dKUR EN *bu-k*] *a-ri i-pa-a-du* 1 UDU *a-na* ^dIŠKUR 1 UDU *a-na* ^dUTU
13. [1 UDU *a-na* ^dKUR 1 UD]U *a-na* ^dÉ-*a* 1 UDU *a-na* ^d30 1 UDU *a-na* ^dNIN.URTA
14. [1 UDU *a-na* ^dA-*lál* 1 UDU *a-na* ^d]EN KI.LAM 1 UDU [*a-na*] ^dEN SI.MEŠ 1 UDU *a-na* ^dNIN.KUR
15. [1 UDU *a-na* ^dNIN-É.GAL-*lì*] ʿ1¹ UDU *a-na* ^dIš₈-*tár LÚ ta-ḫa-z*[*i*] UDU^{hi.a} *an-ni-ta*₅
16. [7 signs *i*]-*pa-a-du*

17. [*i-na* *ša-ni-i* *u*₄-*mi i-na* UD].25.KÁM DINGIR^{meš} *gáb-bu* ù^{d.meš} Ša-*aš-ša*-[*b*]-*e-e-na-tu*₄
18. [*uš-šu*]-ʿú¹ [3 signs] ^dKUR EN SIG₄ *uš-ša* IGI-šú *kut-tu-mu* 2 AMAR^{meš} 6 UDU^{hi.a}
19. ʿša LUGAL¹ ù [1 UDU š] *a URU.KI a-na pa-ni* ^dKUR *il-la-ku*
20. 1 BÁN 1 QA^{ninda} *pa-pa-s*[*u* 1 QA] NINDA.ŠE 1^{dug}ḪA 1^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄ GEŠTIN *ša* LUGAL *a-na* ^dKUR SISKUR-*u*
21. 1 BÁN 1 QA^{ninda} *pa-pa-s*[*u* 1 QA] NINDA.ŠE 1^{dug}ḪA 1^{dug}ḫu-*pár* *ša* É DINGIR-*lì*
22. ½ BÁN^{zi} *pa-pa-sà* 4 BÁN [NINDA.ŠE 4] ^{dug}PIḪÙ *a-na* UN^{meš} 1 AMAR <1> SILA₄ *e-l*[*u*] *a-na* ^dKUR SISKUR ŠÀ-*šu-nu iš-tu* ^{na4}ḫa-ʿar¹-[*ši* 4 signs] UN^{meš} KÚ NAG¹

23. 2 UDU *ša* LUGAL 1 UDU *ša* ʿURU.KI¹ 1 BÁN 1 QA^{ninda} *pa-pa-sà* 1 QA NINDA.ŠE 1^{dug}[ḪA 1]^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄ *ša* LUGAL
24. <<erasure>> 1 QA^{ninda} *pa-pa-sà* 1 [^dḫu-*pár* *ša* É DINGIR-*lì* *a-na* ^dNIN.URTA SISKU[R]

25. ^dŠa-*aš-ša-be-tu*₄ *ša* É ^dNIN.URTA *i-na* KÁ^{na4.meš} *si-ka-na-ti* *u*[š-š]*a*
26. 1 AMAR 6 UDU^{hi.a} *ša* LUGAL 1 UDU *ša* URU.KI 1 BÁN 1 QA^{ninda} *pa-pa-sà* 1 QA [NINDA].ŠE
27. 1^{dug}ḪA 1^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄ GEŠTIN *ša* LUGAL 1 BÁN 1 QA^{ninda} *pa-pa-sà* 1 QA NINDA.[Š]E
28. 1^{dug}ḪA *ša* É DINGIR-*lì* *a-na* ^dŠa-*aš-ša-be-ti* SISKUR-*u*

¹¹ All cases in which I notate the number of signs that should fit a textual lacunae are approximations based on the line-drawing of Emar VI.2.

29. ^dNIN-É.GAL-lì ^d30 u ^dUTU ša É.GAL-lì i-na KÁ^{na4.meš} si-ka-na-ti
30. ú-še-šu-ú¹ 1 AMAR 10 UDU^{hi.a} ša LUGAL a-na pa-ni-šu-nu il-la-ku
31. 3 BÁN 3 QA ^{ninda}pa-pa-sà 3 QA NINDA.ŠE 3 ^{dug}hu-pár 3 ^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄ GEŠTIN
a-na pa-ni-šu-nu SISKUR-u
32. 1 BÁN ^{ninda}pa-pa-sí 4 BÁN NINDA.ŠE 4 ^{dug}PIHÙ ša É.GAL-lì a-na UN^{meš}
33. ŠU.NIGÍN 4 AMAR^{meš} 40 UDU^{hi.a} qa-du-ši
-
34. ki-i-me-e KÚ NAG NA₄^{meš} gáb-bá iš-tu Ì^{meš} ù ÚŠ^{meš} i-ṭar-ru-u
35. UDU.U₈ 2 ta-pal ^{ninda}KUR₄.RA^{meš} pa-pa-sí 1 ^{dug}hu-pár ša LUGAL a-na pa-ni
36. KÁ.GAL ša qa-ab-li ku-ba-da a-na gáb-bi DINGIR^{meš} DÙ 1 UDU.U₈ ša-a-ši
37. a-na gáb-bi DINGIR^{meš} i-qa-al-lu-ú NINDA^{meš} AMAR^{meš} UZU i-na URU e-el-¹lu¹
-
38. i-na ša-ni-ti MU.KÁM^{ezen} zu-[u]k-ra DÙ i-na ITI SAG.M[U]
39. i-na UD.14.KÁM 70 UDU.SILA₄^{meš} KÙ.GA ša LUGAL [5 signs] ¹a¹-na
^{ninda}KUR₄.RA^{meš} Ì¹
40. 3 ^{dug}PIHÙ^{meš} a-na 70 DINGIR^{[m]eš} gáb-bi [ša^{kur}] ¹E¹-mar i-pa-a-du a-na 7
LÚ^[eš] ¹zi¹-ir-a-ti ša É.GAL-lì 7 UDU^{hi.a} iš-tu ŠÀ-šu-ma SUM
41. 1 AMAR 1 SILA₄ a-na ^dKUR EN bu-[k]a-ri i-pa-¹a¹-[du] ù i-na u₄-mi EGIR-ki
42. ša ^{ezen}zu-uk-ri UN^[meš] ¹ù¹ DINGIR^{meš} ši-ni-[š]u uš-šu-ú
43. ma-la al-lu-ti-im-ma i-pa-¹a¹-du
-
44. i-na ša-ni-i u₄-mi i-na UD.15.KÁM i-na u₄-mi [Ša-ag]-ga-ri DÙ
45. ^dKUR EN bu-ka-ri ^dNIN.URTA Ša-aš-ša-b[e-ta ša] É ^dNIN.URTA
46. [^dNIN-É.GAL]-lì ^d30 ¹u¹ ^dUTU ša É.GAL-lì DINGIR^{meš} [gáb-b]i u^{d.meš} Ša-aš-ša-be-
ia-na-ti
47. [8 signs] ¹a¹-na KÁ^{na4.meš} si-ka-na-t[i] ¹ú¹-še-šu-ú
48. [2 signs(?) # AMAR^(meš) # SILA₄^(meš)] ¹KÙ.GA¹ ša LUGAL 10 SILA₄^{meš} ša
[UR]U.KI a-na pa-ni ^dKUR
49. [il-la-ku(?) 1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda}pa-pa]-sú 1 QA NINDA.ŠE 1 ^{dug}HA 1 ^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄
GEŠTIN ša LUGAL
50. [1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda}pa-pa-sú 1 QA NINDA.ŠE] 1 ^{dug}HA ša É DINGIR-lì a-na ^dKUR
SISKUR-u
51. [1 BÁN ^{ninda}pa-pa-sí 4 BÁN NINDA.ŠE 4] ¹dug¹PIHÙ ša É DINGIR-lì a-na UN^{meš}
-
52. [# AMAR^(meš) # SILA₄^(meš) (?) ša] ¹LUGAL¹ 2 SILA₄ ša URU.KI 1 BÁN 1 QA
^[ninda]p]a-pa-sí 1 QA NINDA.ŠE
53. [1 ^{dug}HA 1 ^{dug}]KUR₄.KUR₄ ša LUGAL 1 QA ^{ninda}pa-pa-sí [1 ^{dug}hu-p]ár ša É
DINGIR-lì
-
54. [# AMAR^(meš) # SILA₄^{meš}] ša LUGAL 2 SILA₄^{meš} ša URU.[KI 1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda}]pa-
pa-sí
55. [1 QA NINDA.ŠE 1 ^{dug}H]A 1 ^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄ GEŠTIN ša LUGAL 1 BÁN 1 QA
^[ninda]pa-pa-sí 1 Q]A NINDA.ŠE
56. [1 ^{dug}HA ša] É DINGIR-lì a-na ^dŠa-aš-ša-be-ti SIS[KUR-u]
-
57. [# AMAR^(meš) #] SILA₄^{meš} ša LUGAL 3 BÁN 3 QA ^{zi}pa-pa-[sú/a/i 3 QA]
NINDA.ŠE 3 ^{dug}hu-pár
58. [3 ^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄ GEŠ]TIN ša LUGAL a-na ^dNIN-É.GAL-lì ^d30 [u ^dUTU] ša
É.GAL-lì SISKUR
59. {left edge} 12 AMAR^{meš} a-na DINGIR^[eš] ...]
-

60. [ki-i-m]e-e KÚ NAG^{na4.meš} si-ka-na-ti Ì^{meš} ÚŠ^{meš}
 61. [i-pá-š]a-šu i-na pa-ni nu-ba-at-ti DINGIR^{meš} i-na URU ú-še-lu-ú
 62. [a-na pa-n]i KÁ.GAL š[a qa-a]b-li ku-ba-da TUR DÙ 1 UDU.U₈ 1^{dug} hu-pár
 63. {lower edge} [2 t]a-pal^{ninda} pa-pa-sí [ša] LUGAL a-na DINGIR^{meš} gáb-bi i-qa-al-lu-ú
 64. {lower edge} [NINDA^{meš} UZ]U [i-na URU] ʾél¹-li-ú

Column II

{4-6 lines missing (Fleming)}

- 65 + Emar 424:1. x x x [3 signs] DINGIR^{meš} gáb-bá [10 signs]
 66 + Emar 424:2. AMAR^{meš} UDU[^{hi.a} gá]b-bi GEŠTIN^{meš} gáb-bá [8 signs]
 67 + Emar 424:3. ma-la a[l¹-lu-ti-i]m i-na-an-di-nu [vacat]

 68 + Emar 424:4. ki-i-me-e [KÚ NAG]^{na4} si-ka-na-ti Ì^{meš} ÚŠ^{meš} i-pá-ša-šu
 69 + Emar 424:5. ù ʾ5+n UD¹ [i-na u₄-mi-ma (??) ku-b]a-da TUR 1 UDU.U₈ ʾx¹ [8 signs]
 70 + Emar 424:6. i-[9 signs] ʾx a-na muh¹-[hi 7 signs]
 71. [20 signs]
 72. [16 signs] NI DÙ [vacat?]

 73. [12 signs] ša 8 ku-ba-di^{meš} [2 signs]
 74. [6 signs^{dug} hu]u-pár NU.Ú[R.MA^{meš}]ʾ(?) MUŠEN^{hi.a} ša LUGAL [2 signs]

 75. UD.7.KÁM ša^{ezen} zu-uk-ri DINGIR^{meš} [ʾuru] ʾE¹-mar gáb-bá i-pa-al-[la-hu]

 76. 1 AMAR 10 SILA₄^{meš} KÙ.GA 1 BÁN 1 QA [ʾninda] pa-pa-sí 1 QA NINDA.ŠE [1^{dug} HA]

 77. 1^{dug} KUR₄.KUR₄ ša É.GAL-lì a-na ʾd¹ KUR EN bu-ka-ri [SISKUR-u]

 78. a-na^d IŠKUR ki-i^d K[UR EN bu-ka-ri]
 79. a-na^d KUR KI.MIN
 80. a-na^d É-a KI.MIN
 81. a-na^d 30 u^d UTU <KI>.MIN
 82. a-na^d NIN.URTA K[I.MIN]
 83. a-na^d A-lál [KI.MIN]
 84. a-na^d GÌR.UNU.GAL [EN KI.LAM KI.MIN]
 85. a-na^d GÌR.UNU.GA[L EN SI^{meš} KI.MIN]
 86. a-na^d NIN.KUR [KI.MIN]
 87. a-na^d NIN-É.GAL-lì [KI.MIN]
 88. a-na^d <<Iš₈>> INANNA ša Šu-[bi KI.MIN]
 89. a-na^d 30 ša É.GA[L-lì KI.MIN]
 90. a-na^d UTU ša É.G[AL-lì KI.MIN]
 91. a-na^d KUR ša É.G[AL-lì KI.MIN]
 92. a-na^d INANNA ša [... KI.MIN]
 93. a-na^d INANNA š[a ... KI.MIN]
 94. a-na^d INANNA š[a ... KI.MIN]
 95. a-na^d ʾx x¹ [... KI.MIN]

 96. 5 SILA₄^{meš} ša LUGAL <1> BÁN <1> QA^{ninda} pa-pa-sí 1 QA ʾNINDA¹ [ŠE 1^{dug} HA
 1^{dug} KUR₄.KUR₄ GEŠTIN]
 97. a-na^d KUR EN ha-ar-ri KI.MIN

98. *a-na* 2 ^dKUR EN *qu-ú-ni* 2 *ta-pa*[l KI.MIN]
99. *a-na* <^d>*An-na ša kib-ri* [KI.MIN]
100. *a-na* ^dKUR EN *kar-še ki-i ša* ^dKUR-ma EN ^r*da*¹-[*ad-mi*(?) KI.MIN]
101. *a-na* ^dKUR EN *da-ad-mi* KI.MIN
102. *a-na* ^dINANNA *ša a-bi u* ^d*Ya-a-mi* 2 *ta-pal* K[I.MIN]
103. *a-na* ^d[*Hal*(?)]-ma <KI.MIN>
104. *a-na* ^d[INAN]NA *ša tu-ri-ši* KI.MIN
105. <*a-na*> ^d*Iš-ḥa-ra* GAŠAN URU.KI KI.MIN
106. *a-na* ^d*Iš-ḥa-ra ša* LUGAL KI.MIN
107. *a-na* ^d*Iš-ḥa-ra ša* ^{sal.meš}*mu_x-nab-bi-ia-t*[i KI.MIN]
108. *a-na* ^d[*G*]*a*(?)-*na-na ša* É.GAL-*lì* KI.MIN
109. *a-na* ^d[*G*]*a*(?)-*na-na ša* URU.KI KI.MIN
110. *a-na* ^d*Ud-ḥa* KI.MIN
111. *a-na* ^d*Aš-^rtar*¹ K[I.MIN]
112. *ù a-na gáb-bi* DINGIR^{meš} *an-nu-ti* ^{dug}*ḥar-de-e* GE[ŠTIN[?] ...]

113. 2 SILA^{meš} <*ša*> LUGAL¹ 1 QA ^{ninda}*pa-pa-si* 1 QA NINDA.ŠE 1 ^{dug}[ḤA 1
^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄ GEŠTIN *ša* LUGAL]
114. *a-na* ^dEN *Ga-ab-a* KI.MIN
115. *a-na* ^dKUR EN *Am-qí* KI.MIN
116. *a-na* ^dKUR EN *Šu-mi* KI.MIN
117. *a-na* ^dKUR EN *Bu-uz-qa* KI.MIN
118. *a-na* ^dKUR EN *Ya-^rbu-ur*¹ KI.MIN
119. *a-na* ^dINANNA ^r*x x*¹[*x*]^r*x*¹ KI.MIN
120. *a-na* ^d*A*¹-[*dam-ma-te-ra ša*] É *d*[*ú-u*]*g-li* K[I.MIN]
121. *a-na* [...] KI.MIN
122. *a-na* [...] KI.MIN
123. *a-na* 2 ^d[...] KI.MIN
124. *a-na* ^d*Mu*-[*sa-nu*(?) KI.MIN
125. *a-na* ^d*Ša-a*[*g-ga-ar*] K[I.MIN]
126. *a-na* ^dEN *Ak*-[*ka*(?)] KI.MIN
127. *a-na* ^dEN *I*-[*ma-ar*(?)] KI.MIN
128. *a-na* ^dIŠKUR EN [...] KI.MIN
129. *a-na* ^d*Ga-aš-r*[*u*] KI.MIN
130. *a-na* ^dEN *ša-a*-[*lu-li pa-sú-ri* (?)] KI.MIN
131. *a-na* ^dEN *Bu*[-*uz-qa* (?)] KI.MIN
132. *a-na* ^dEN *Ya*[-*bu-ur* (?)] KI.MIN
133. *a-na* ^dEN *Na*[...]] KI.MIN

Column III

134. [*a-na* 7 ^d*Im-li-k*]*u ša* 6 KÁ.GAL^{meš} KI.MIN
135. *a-na* [^d 5 signs]-*bi* KI.MIN
136. *a-na* ^r*d*¹ *Si*¹-*bit-ti* KI.MIN
137. *a-na* ^d[*x*]-*la-a-ba* KI.MIN
138. *a-na* ^dEN *Šag-ma* KI.MIN
139. *a-na* ^dIŠKUR ^{kur}*Ba-ši*¹-*ma-’a* KI.MIN

140. *a-na* ^d*Na-wa-ar-ni* KI.MIN
 141. *a-na* 2 *ta-pal* ^dKASKAL.KUR.RA^{meš} *ša* ^{giš}KIRI₆ É.GAL-*li* KI.MIN
 142. *a-na* ^dNIN.ṚURTA¹ *ša ma-qa-li* KI.MIN
 143. [*a-n*]*a* ^dIŠKUR EN *I-[ma]r* KI.MIN
 144. *a-na* ^dNIN.ṚURTA EN¹ *ku-ma-ri* KI.MIN
 145. *a-na* ^dINANNA GAŠAN *a*[?]-[*x*]-Ṛ^{ni?}¹ KI.MIN
 146. *a-na* ^dKASKAL.KUR.RA^{meš} *ša hu-ut-ta-ni* KI[.MIN]
 147. *a-na* ^dNIN.KUR GAŠAN *na-aḥ-li* KI[.MIN]
 148. *a-na* ^dNIN.KUR GAŠAN *ka-ak-ka-r*[*i* KI.MIN]
 149. *a-na* ^dKUR EN *ša-lu-li pa-sú-ri* K[.MIN]
 150. *a-n*[*a*] ^dKUR EN *ma-aš-ša-ri* KI.M[IN]
 151. *a-na* ^dKASKAL.KUR.RA^{meš} *ša ḥi-iṭ-ṭi* KI.MIN
 152. *a-n*[*a*] ^dEN *Ra-ab-ba* KI.MIN
 153. *a-[na]* ^dNIN.KUR GAŠAN *Iš-[p]a-a-at* KI.MIN
 154. *a-[na]* ^dKUR EN *Iš-pa-a-Ṛat¹ KI.MIN
 155. *a-na* ^{Ṛd}¹KUR EN *ḥa-pa-[š]u*[?] KI.MIN
 156. *a-na* ^{Ṛd}¹*Li-'i-[m]i Šar-ta* KI.MIN
 157. *a-na* ^dNIN.KUR *ša KÁ Li-'i-mi Šar-ta* [KI.MIN]
 158. *a-na* ^{Ṛd}¹IM *ša É Gad-dá* KI.[MIN]
 159. *a-na* ^dSi-ka-ni *ša* ^dHé-bat KI.[MIN]
 160. *a-na* ^{Ṛd}EN *ra-qa-ti* KI¹[.MIN]
 161. *a-n*[*a*]
 162. ^{Ṛa}¹-[*na*]*

-
 374:1. [5 signs] x x [12 signs]
 374:2. [4 signs *a*]-*na pa-ni* [12 signs]
 374:3. [4 signs]Ṛ^x¹ NINDA^{meš} UZU[*a/i-na* (ŠÀ) URU *e-el-lu* (?) 6 signs]
 374:4. [2 signs *il-l*]*a-ku* *ù gáb-b*[*á* DINGIR^{meš} 9 signs]
 374: 5. *ša* É^{bi.a} *ù* *ša be-ra*[-*at* ^{na4.meš}*si-ka-na-ti* vacat?]
 374: 6. *i-na-aš-šu-ni-ma i-na tu-ur-ti* [11 signs]
 374: 7. *ù šum-ma* AMAR SILA₄ *ša* [11 signs]
 374: 8. *šum-ma* *ša* É.GAL-*li* *ù šum-ma* [10 signs]
 374: 9. *i-na tu-ur-ti i-šak-ka-nu* [*ki-i-me-e* KÚ NAG ^{na4.meš}*si-ka-na-ti*]
 374: 10. ÚŠ^{meš} Ṛ^{meš} *i-tar-ru-ú* [10 signs *i-na*(?)]
 374: 11. *tu-ur-ti ip-pa-šu* [12 signs]
 374: 12. *ša* LÚ^{meš}[!] *nu-pu-ḥa-Ṛnu¹ [13 signs]
 374: 13. *a-na pa-ni* ^Ṛ*tu-ur*¹[-*ti* 14 signs]*

Column IV

163. [2 signs ^{giš}]MAR.GÍD.DA [*ša* ^dKUR *i-na b*]*e-ra-at* ^{na4.meš}*s*[*i-ka-na-ti e-(et-)ti-iq*]
 164. [*pa-nu-š*]*u pè-tu-u* [*a-na li-it*] ^dNIN.URTA *il-l*[*ak* 3 signs ^dNIN.URTA]
 165 + 425:1. [*it-ti*]-*šu uš-ra*[*ka-bu-ma*] DINGIR^{meš} EGIR-*ki-šu il-la-ku i-n*[*a u₄-mi* (?) *ša-a*]-*šú* (?)

166 + 425:2. [a-na KÁ.GAL ša (?) qa-a]b-li i-kaš-ša-[du k]u-ba-da TUR DÙ [1
UDU.]U₈ ša-a-ši [2 ta-pa]l^{ninda}KUR₄.RA
167 + 425:3. [1^{dug}hu-pár] ša LUGAL a-na gáb-bi DINGIR^{m[es]} i-qa-al-lu]-^rú¹ Ì UDU
NA₄^{meš} i-pá-aš-ša-šú
168 + 425:4. [3 signs^{giš}Š]INIG a-na muh-ḫi DINIGR^{meš} 3 signs i-p]á-aš-ša-šu vacat

vacat
(space of 8 lines)

169. [e-nu-m]^ra¹ DUMU^{meš} kur E-mar i-na MU.7.KÁM^{meš} ezen zu-uk-ra
170. [a-na]^rd¹KUR EN bu-ka-ri i-na-an-di-nu i-na MU.6.KÁM i-na ITI SAG.MU
171. ^ri¹[na UD.1]5.KÁM i-na u₄-mi Ša-ag-ga-ri^dKUR EN bu-ka-ri ú-še-šu
172. pa-nu-^ršu¹[pè-t]u-ú ku-ba-da TUR <<erasure>> i-na KÁ^{na4.meš} si-ka-na-ti
173. a-na pa-ni-[šu] DÙ ki-i-me-e SISKUR KÚ NAG pa-ni-šu ú-kat-ta-mu
174. i-na be-ra-a[t^{na}]^{4.meš} si-ik-ka-na-ti^{giš}MAR.GÍD.DA ša^dKUR e-et-ti-iq
175. a-na li-it^d[NIN.URTA i]l-lak^dNIN.URTA it-ti-šu uš-ra-ka-bu-ma
176. pa-nu-šu-nu ku-ut-t[u-mu i-na] u₄-mi ša-a-šú GUD^{meš} UDU^{hi.a} gáb-bi ul-lu-lu
177. i-na u₄-mi ša-a-šu^rd¹[KUR EN bu-ka-ri] ú-še-šu-ú i-n[a] pa-ni nu-ba-at-ti
178. ^dŠa-ag-ga-ar [ù Ša-aš-ša-be-tu₄ š]a É^dNIN.URTA i-na É dug-li
179. ú-še-šu-ú ù [NINDA^{meš} UZU ša pa-ni DINGIR^{meš} a-na Š]Á^{uru} E-mar gáb-bi el-lu

180. i-na ITI Ni-qa-l[i i-na UD.25.KÁM^dKUR EN]^rbu¹-ka-ri ù DINGIR^{meš} gáb-bá
181. a-na KÁ^{na4.meš} si-^rka-na-ti¹ ú-še-šu^rpa¹-[nu-šu] a-na a-ši-šu
182. ù na-ḫa-si-šu ku-ut-tu-mu iš-tu u₄-mi ša-a-šu AMAR^{meš} SILA₄^{meš} KÙ.GA
183. GÍR^rZABAR[?] ú-qāt-ta¹-ru^{giš}MAR.GÍD.DA i-na be-ra-at^{na4.meš} si-ka-na-ti
184. e-et-ti-iq a-na li-it^dNIN.URTA il-lak ù NINDA^{meš} UZU ša pa-[ni] DINGIR^{meš}
185. a-na ŠÁ URU.KI e-[e]l-li

186. i-na ša-ni-ti [M]U.KÁM i-na ITI SAG.MU i-na UD.14.KÁM SILA₄^{meš} pa-a-da-t[i]
187. a-na DINGIR^{meš} ú-z[a-a]-zu ša-ni-i u₄-mi UD.15.KÁM Ša-ag-ga-ru^dKUR EN bu-
ka-ri
188. ù DINGIR^{meš} gáb-[bá]^rd¹Ša-aš-ša-be-ia-na-tu₄ a-na KÁ^{na4.meš} si-ka-na-ti ú-še-šu-ú
189. pa-ni^dKUR i-na^ra-ši¹-šu ku-ut-tu-mu SISKUR^{meš} ki-i ša i-na ṭup-pí ša-aṭ-ru
190. a-na DINGIR^{meš} SUM-nu^dKUR a-pu-ma ù^dŠag-gàr i-na u₄-mi ša-a-šu-ma ú-še-šu-
^rú¹
191. ù NINDA^{meš} Šag-ga-ru ša gáb-bi URU.KI E-mar el-lu i-na pa-ni nu-bat-ti
192. ^dKUR i-na be-ra-at^{na4.meš} si-ka-na-ti e-ti-iq pa-ni-šu ú-kat-ta-m[u]
193. i-na KÁ.GAL ša qa-ab-li pár-ši ki-i ša u₄-mi qa-du-ši-ma DÙ-šú
194. NINDA^{meš} UZU ša pa-ni DINGIR^{meš} i-na URU.KI e-el-li

195. i-na UD.6.KÁM SILA₄^{meš} pa-a-da-ti ki-i ša i-na ma-ḫi-ri-im-ma-a
196. a-na DINGIR^{meš} ú-za-^ra¹-zu

197. *i-na* UD.7.KÁM ^dKUR ù DINGIR^{meš} *gáb-bu* ^{d.meš}Ša-ša-be-ia-na-ta uš-šu-ú [*i-na a-ši-šu(?)*]
198. *pa-ni-šu ku-ut-tu-mu pár-ša ki-i ša u₄-mi ma-ḫi-ri-im-ma a-na* DINGIR^{meš} [*gáb-bi*]
199. *i-na-ad-di-nu* UZU NINDA^{meš} *gáb-bi* <<erasure>> *mi-im-ma ša ik-ka-lu ša* ʾÉ¹ [^{hi.a}]
200. ù ša [*be-ra-at*] ^{na4.meš}*si-ka-na-ti i-na-aš-šu-mi i-na tu-ur-t*[*i i-šak-ka-nu*]
201. *mi-im*[-*ma a-na*] ŠÀ URU *ú-ul e-el-li ki-i-me-e* IZI *i-na* [4 signs]
202. *ú-ʾx*¹[-1 sign *pa*]-*ni* ^dKUR *i-pè-tu-ú* ^{giš}MAR.GÍD.DA *ša* ^dK[UR *i-na be-ra-at*]
203. ʾna4¹[^{meš}*si-ka-na*]-*ti e-ti-iq a-na muḫ-ḫi* ^dNIN.URTA *il-l*[*ak* ^dNIN.URTA *it-ti-šu*]
204. [*uš-ra-ka-bu p*]*ár-ša ki-i ša i-na u₄-mi ma-ḫi-ri-ma* DÙ-šú [5 signs or vacat]
-
205. [*e-nu-ma* DUMU^{meš} ^{kur}*E-mar*]^{ʾezen}*zu-uk*¹-*ra ú-qa*[-*ad-da-šu* 3 signs]
-
- 374:14. [...]x-*ta*
- 374:15. [...]ʾLUGAL x¹ [1 sign] x-*ri-šu*
- 374:16. [...] *ša-na-a i-na* A.ŠÀ-ša DÙ-*aš*
- 374:17. [...]ʾx¹ *ba*^ʾ-*al-tá*
- 374:18. [...] ^{meš}*ša-nu-nim-ma*
- 374:19. [...] ^dKUR E]N *bu-ka-ri*
- 374:20. [...] *a-na*] ^dKUR EN *bu-ka-ri* SISKUR
-
- 374:21. [...] A <<U>>
-
206. {left edge} ŠU.NIGÍN 7 *me* SILA₄^{meš} 50 AMAR^{meš}

Translation of Emar 373+

Column I

1. [...] 1 *seah* of porridge-]bread, 4 *seah* of b[arley bread, 4 *pīḫu* for the people.]
 2. [1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread, 1 ḪA-vessel, 1 *kurk*]urru from the king to Dagan
 3. [they will offer. 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread, 1 ḪA-vessel from the Temple of the Gods before] Dagan
 4. [they will offer. ...] they will pour (?) them out.
-
5. [...] x x [in the sixth year, in the month of] SAG.MU, on the 25th day
 6. [...] x x [...] twentieth(?) [...]
 7. [...] pure lam[b(s) for all the gods of] Emar [they will restrain(?).]
 8. [...] xx [...] from within it imp[ure(?) ...]
 9. [...] they will pour out(?).
-
10. [In the month of Niqalu] on the 24th day [#] *seah* of barley bread, 2 *pīḫu*
 11. [...] from the king they will distribute among all the gods.
 12. [One sheep for Dagan Lord of the First Fruit] they will restrain. One sheep for ^dIŠKUR, one sheep for UTU,
 13. [one sheep for Dagan, one sheep] for Ea, one sheep for Šaggar, one sheep for ^dNIN.URTA
 14. [one sheep for Alal, one sheep for the] Lord of Commerce, one sheep [for] the Lord of the Horns, one sheep for ^dNIN.KUR,

15. [one sheep for Bēlet-ekalli,] one sheep for Aštartu of the Soldier; these sheep
 16. [...] they will restrain.
-
17. [On the next day,] on the 25th [day], all the gods and the *šaššabēnātu*
 18. [will go out...] Dagan Lord of the Brick will go out, his face veiled. Two calves and six sheep
 19. from the king and [one sheep from] the city will process before Dagan.
 20. 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, [1 *qa* of barley bread, 1 ḪA-vessel, 1 *kurkurru* of wine from the king they will offer to Dagan.
 21. 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, [1 *qa* of] barley bread, 1 ḪA-vessel, 1 *huppar* from the Temple of the Gods.
 22. ½ *seah* of porridge meal (?), 4 *seah* [of barley bread, 4] *pīhu* for the people. 1 calf (and) <1> pure lamb they will offer to Dagan. From among them⁽¹⁾ the *harṣu*-stones [...] The people will feast [...]
-
23. 2 sheep from the king, 1 sheep from the city, 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread, 1 [ḪA]-vessel, [1] *kurkurru* from the king
 24. (erasure) 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, 1 *huppar* from the Temple of the Gods they will offer to ^dNIN.URTA.
-
25. Šaššabēttu of ^dNIN.URTA's temple will go out to the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones
 26. 1 calf 6 sheep from the king, 1 sheep from the city, 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread
 27. 1 ḪA-vessel, 1 *kurkurru* of wine from the king, 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread
 28. 1 ḪA-vessel from the Temple of the Gods they will offer to Šaššabēttu.
-
29. Bēlet-ekalli, ^d30, and ^dUTU of the palace to the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones
 30. they will bring out. 1 calf, 10 sheep from the king will process before them.
 31. 3 *seah* 3 *qa* of porridge-bread, 3 *qa* of barley bread, 3 *huppar* 3 *kurkurru* of wine they will offer before them.
 32. 1 *seah* of porridge-bread, 4 *seah* of barley bread, 4 *pīhu* from the palace for the people.
 33. Total: 4 calves, 40 sheep for the Consecration.
-
34. When they feast, they will rub all the stones with oil and blood.
 35. (With) a ewe, a pair of thick loaves, porridge-bread, 1 *huppar* from the king in front of
 36. the Central City Gate they will perform the Glorification Ceremony for all the gods. That ewe
 37. they will burn for all the gods. The bread, the calves—(that is,) the meat—will go up into the city.
-
38. In the next year they perform the *zukru* festival. In the month of SAG.MU
 39. on the 14th day, seventy pure lambs from the king [...] for thick loaves, oil
 40. 3 *pīhu* for all seventy gods of Emar they will restrain. They will give seven sheep from among them to the seven *zirāti*-men of the palace.
 41. 1 calf, 1 lamb they will restrain for Dagan Lord of the First Fruit. On a later day
 42. of the *zukru* festival, the people and the gods will go out a second time—
 43. as many (provisions) as (for) the other (processions) they will restrain.
-
44. On the next day, on the 15th day, on the day of Šaggar, they perform (it).
 45. Dagan Lord of the First Fruit, ^dNIN.URTA, Šaššabēttu of ^dNIN.URTA's temple

46. [Bēlet-ekalli,] ^d30, ^dUTU of the Palace, all the gods and the *šaššabeyānātu*
 47. [before evening(?)] they bring out to the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones.
 48. [(...?) # calves, #] pure [lamb(s)] from the king and 10 lambs from the city before Dagan
 49. [will process(?). 1 *seah* 1 *qa* porridge]-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread, 1 ḪA-vessel, 1 *kurkurru* of wine from the king
 50. [1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread] 1 ḪA-vessel from the Temple of the Gods they will offer to Dagan.
 51. [1 *seah* of porridge-bread, 4 *seah* of barley bread, 4] *pīḫu* from the Temple of the Gods (are) for the people.

 52. [# calves, # lambs from] the king, 2 lambs from the city, 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of [porr]idge-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread,
 53. [1 ḪA-vessel, 1] *kurkurru* from the king, 1 *qa* of porridge bread, [1 *hupp*]ar from the Temple of the Gods.

 54. [# calves, # lambs] from the king, 2 lambs from the ci[ty, 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of] porridge-bread,
 55. [1 *qa* of barley bread, 1 ḪA-vessel, 1 *kurkurru* of wine from the king, 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of [porridge-bread, 1 *q*]a of barely bread
 56. [1 ḪA-vessel from] the Temple of the Gods they will offer to Šaššabēttu.

 57. [# calves, #] lambs from the king, 3 *seah*, 3 *qa* of porr[idge-flour, 3 *qa*] of barley bread, 3 *huppar*
 58. [3 *kurkurru* of wi]ne from the king to Bēlet-ekalli, ^d30, [and ^dUTU] of the palace they will offer.
 59. Twelve calves for the gods [...]

 60. [Whe]n they feast, the *sikkānu*-Stones with oil and blood
 61. [they will an]oint. Before evening they will bring up the gods into the city.
 62. [In front of] the Central City Gate they will perform the minor Glorification Ceremony. 1 ewe, 1 *huppar*,
 63. [A] pair of porridge-loaves [from] the king they will burn for all the gods.
 64. [The breads (and) me]at go up [into the city].

Column II

- 65 + Emar 424:1. [...] all the gods [...]
 66 + Emar 424:2. [a]ll the calves, sheep (and) all the wine [...]
 67 + Emar 424:3. As many (provisions) as for [the other (processions)] they will give.
 68 + Emar 424:4. When [they feast, they will anoint] the *sikkānu*-stones with oil [and blood.]
 69 + Emar 424:5. And 5+n days [on each day (??)] the minor Glorification (with) 1 ewe [...]
 70 + Emar 424:6. [...] upon [...]
 71. [...]
 72. [...]

 73. [...] of the eight Glorification Ceremonies[...]
 74. [...*h*]uppar, po[megranat]es, (and) birds from the king [...]

 75. For the seven days of the *zukru* festival they will worship all the gods of Emar.

76. 1 calf, 10 pure lambs, 1 *seah* 1 *qa* of porridge bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread [1 ḪA-vessel]

77. 1 *kurkurru* from the palace they will offer to Dagan lord of the First Fruit.

78. to ^dIŠKUR just as (for) D[agan Lord of the First Fruit]

79. to Dagan ditto

80. to Ea ditto

81. to ^d30 and ^dUTU ditto

82. to ^dNIN.URTA di[tto]

83. to Alal [ditto]

84. to Rašap [Lord of Commerce ditto]

85. to Rašap [Lord of Horns ditto]

86. to ^dNIN.KUR [ditto]

87. to Bēlet-ekal]li ditto]

88. to Aštartu of Šu[bi ditto]

89. to ^d30 of the Pala[ce ditto]

90. to ^dUTU of Pala[ce ditto]

91. to Dagan of the Pala[ce ditto]

92. to Aštartu of [... ditto]

93. to Aštartu o[f ... ditto]

94. to Aštartu o[f ... ditto]

95. to [DN ... ditto]

96. 5 lambs from the king, <1> *seah* <1> *qa* of porridge bread, 1 *qa* of [barley] bread [1 ḪA-vessel, 1 *kurkurru* of wine]

97. to Dagan Lord of the Hole ditto

98. to both Dagens Lord(s) of Creation— a pai[r ditto]

99. to Anna of the Riverbank [ditto]

100. to Dagan Lord of Encampments just as for Dagan Lord of Se[ttlements ditto]

101. to Dagan Lord of Settlements ditto

102. to Aštartu of the *abi* and Yammu— a pair d[itto]

103. to [Hal]ma(?) <ditto>

104. to [Ašta]rte of the Harvest ditto

105. <to> Išhara Lady of the City ditto

106. to Išhara of the King ditto

107. to Išhara of the *munabbiāt*[u ditto]

108. to [Ga]nana(?) of the Palace ditto

109. to [Ga]nana(?) of the City ditto

110. to Udha ditto

111. to Aštar d[itto]

112. and to all these gods *hardu*-vessels(?) of w[ine(?) ...]

113. 2 lambs <from> the king, 1 *qa* of porridge-bread, 1 *qa* of barley bread, 1 [ḪA]-vessel, 1 *kurkurru* of wine from the king]

114. to the Lord of the Hill ditto

115. to Dagan Lord of the Valley ditto

116. to Dagan Lord of Šumi ditto

117. to Dagan Lord of Buzqa ditto

118. to Dagan Lord of Yabur ditto

119. to Aštartu ... ditto
 120. to [Adammatera of] the *bīt d[ú-u]g-li* d[itto]
 121. to [...] ditto]
 122. to [...] ditto]
 123. to (the) two [...] ditto]
 124. to Mu[sanu(?) ditto]
 125. to Ša[ggar] d[itto]
 126. to the Lord of Ak[ka(?)] ditto
 127. to the Lord of I[mar(?)] ditto
 128. to ^dIŠKUR Lord of [...] ditto
 129. to Gašr[u] ditto
 130. to the Lord of Shel[ter and Protection] ditto
 131. to the Lord of Bu[zqa (?)] ditto
 132. to the Lord of Ya[bur (?)] ditto
 133. to the Lord of [...] ditto

Column III

134. [to the Seven Divine Counselor]s of the Six City Gates ditto
 135. to [...] ditto
 136. to the Seven ditto
 137. to ^d[x]-*la-a-ba* ditto
 138. to the Lord of Šagma ditto
 139. to ^dIŠKUR of Bašima'a ditto
 140. to Nawarni ditto
 141. to the pair of Balih-gods of the Palace Garden ditto
 142. to ^dNIN.URTA of Burnt Offerings ditto
 143. [t]o ^dIŠKUR Lord of Imar ditto
 144. to ^dNIN.URTA Lord of Kumari ditto
 145. to Aštartu Lady of [...] ditto
 146. to the Balih-gods of Huddanu (?) di[tto]
 147. to ^dNIN.KUR Lady of the Wadi di[tto]
 148. to ^dNIN.KUR Lady of the Region [ditto]
 149. to Dagan Lord of Shelter and Protection [ditto]
 150. t[o] Dagan Lord of the Guard ditt[o]
 151. to the Balih-gods of Wheat ditto
 152. t[o] the Lord of Rabbâ ditto
 153. t[o] ^dNIN.KUR, Lady of Išpa'at ditto
 154. t[o] Dagan, Lord of Išpa'at ditto
 155. to Dagan Lord of ... ditto
 156. to Li'[m]i-Šarta ditto
 157. to ^dNIN.KUR of the Gate of Li'mi-Šarta [ditto]
 158. to ^dIŠKUR of the House of Fortune ditto
 159. to the *sikkānu*-stone of Ḫebat ditto
 160. to the Lord of Fluvial Land di[tto]
 161. t[o]

162. t[o]

.....

374:1. [...]

374:2. [...] in front of [...]

374:3. [...] the bread (and) meat will go up into the city [...]

374:4. [...] they will] go and all [the gods ...]

374: 5. from the temples and from bet[ween the *sikkānu*-stones (...)]

374: 6. they will pick up and during the return [...]

374: 7. and if the calf (and) lamb are from [...]

374: 8. whether from the palace or [...]

374: 9. they will place (them) during the return. [When they feast, the *sikkānu*-stones]

374: 10. they will rub with blood and oil. [... during(?)]

374: 11. the return they will perform. [...]

374: 12. from the *nupuhannū* -men [...]

374: 13. prior to the retu[rn ...]

.....

Column IV

163. [...] the wagon [of Dagan will pass b]etween the *si[kkānu* stones.]

164. [his face] is unveiled. He will go to ^dNIN.URTA. [...^dNIN.URTA]

165 + 425:1. they will mount up with him. The gods will go behind him. On [that very day(?)]

166 + 425:2. they will arrive [at the Central City G]ate. They will perform the minor Glorification Ceremony. That 1 [ew]e, [a pair] of thick porridge loaves,

167 + 425:3. [1 *huppar*] from the king they will [burn] for all the gods. (With) the sheep fat they will anoint the stones.

168 + 425:4. [... of t]amarisk they will [sm]ear upon the gods [...]

169. [When] the Emarites give the *zukru* festival in the 7th years

170. [to] Dagan Lord of the First Fruit, in the 6th year, in the month of SAG.MU

171. [on the 15th day,] on the day of Šaggar, they will bring out Dagan Lord of the First Fruit,

172. his face unveiled. The minor Glorification Ceremony at the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones

173. they will perform before him. When they feast, they will veil his face.

174. The wagon of Dagan will pass between the *sikkānu*-stones.

175. It will go to ^dNIN.URTA. They will mount ^dNIN.URTA up with him,

176. their faces veil[ed. On] that same day, the oxen and sheep are pure.

177. On that same day, they will bring out [Dagan Lord of the First Fruit]. Before evening they will bring out
178. Šaggar [and Šaššabêttu o]f ^dNIN.URTA temple from the *bīt dug-li*.
179. [The bread and meat in front of the gods]—all of it will go up into Emar.
-
180. In the month of Niqalu [on the 25th day Dagan Lord] of the First Fruit and all the gods
181. they will bring out to the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones, [his fa]ce veiled for his departure
182. and his return. From that same day, the calves and pure lambs
183. by the bronze(?) knife they will send up as smoke offerings(?). The wagon (of Dagan) will pass between the *sikkānu*-stones.
184. It will go to ^dNIN.URTA. The bread and the meat in front of the gods
185. will go up into the city.
-
186. In the next year, in the month of SAG.MU, on the 14th day, they will distribute the restrained lambs
187. among the gods. The next day, the 15th, Šaggar(-day), Dagan Lord of the First Fruit,
188. and all the gods (and) *šaššabeyānātu* they will bring out to the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones.
189. The face of Dagan is veiled during his departure. They will give the sacrifices according to what is written on the tablet
190. to the gods. On that very same day, they will bring out Dagan, visible, and Šaggar.
191. Also the bread of Šaggar of all the city of Emar will go up. Before evening
192. Dagan will pass between the *sikkānu*-stones. They will veil his face.
193. At the Central City Gate they will perform the rites just like the Consecration Day.
194. The bread (and) meat in front of the gods will go up into the city.
-
195. On the 6th day, they will distribute the restrained lambs
196. among the gods, just as (was done) previously.
-
197. On the 7th day, Dagan and all the gods (and) *šaššabeyānātu* will go out. [During his departure(?)]
198. his face is veiled. They will give the rite to [all] the gods just as (for) the previous day.
199. All the meat (and) bread—anything which they should eat—from the temple[s]
200. and from [between] the *sikkānu*-stones they will pick up and during the return [they will place.]
201. No[thing] will go up [into] the city. When the fire in [...]
202. [...], they will unveil the [fa]ce of Dagan. The wagon of Dagan will pass [between]
203. [the *sikkānu*-stones]. It will go to ^dNIN.URTA. [They will mount ^dNIN.URTA up with him.]
-
204. They will perform the rite just as (for) the previous day.
-
205. [When the Emarites] conse[crate] the *zukru*-festival [...]
-
- 374:14. [...]
- 374:15. [...] the king [...] ...
- 374:16. [...] a second time [...] he will do in her field.
- 374:17. [...] alive
- 374:18. [...] second

374:19. [... Dagan Lo]rd of the First Fruit

374:20. [...to] Dagan Lord of the First Fruit they will sacrifice.

374:21. [...]

.....

206. Total: 700 lambs, 50 calves.

Table 5. *Patterns of Foodstuff Offerings*

Pattern 1 – Offering from the King (/Palace)							
ln. 20	1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda} pa- pa-s[u]	[1 QA] NINDA.ŠE	1 ^{dug} HA	1 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠTIN	ša LUGAL	a-na ^d KUR	SISKUR-u
ln. 23	1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda} pa- pa-sà	1 QA NINDA.ŠE	1 ^{dug} [HA]	[1] ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄	ša LUGAL	¹²	
ln. 26-27	1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda} pa- pa-sà	1 QA [NINDA].ŠE	1 ^{dug} HA	1 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠTIN	ša LUGAL	¹³	
ln. 49	[1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda} pa- pa]-sú	1 QA NINDA.ŠE	1 ^{dug} HA	1 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠTIN	ša LUGAL	¹⁴	
ln. 52-53	1 BÁN 1 QA [^{ninda} p]a- pa-sí	1 QA NINDA.ŠE	[1 ^{dug} HA]	[1 ^{dug}]KUR ₄ .KUR ₄	ša LUGAL		
ln. 54-55	[1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda}]pa- pa-sí	[1 QA NINDA.ŠE]	[1 ^{dug} H]A	1 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠTIN	ša LUGAL		
ln. 96	<1> BÁN <1> QA ^{ninda} pa-pa-sí	1 QA [NINDA ¹ .ŠE]	[1 ^{dug} HA]	[1 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠTIN]			

¹² It is possible that the erasure at the head of line 24 should provide a verb and/or indirect object.¹³ This exemplar is not followed by a verb or indirect object, demonstrating that these elements are not necessary for a complete expression of the pattern. Cf. also lines 52-53.¹⁴ The broken beginning of line 50 could contain a verb and/or indirect object.

ln. 113	1 QA ^{ninda} <i>pa-sí</i>	1 QA NINDA.ŠE	1 ^{dug} [ḪA]	[1 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠTIN]	[ša É LUGAL]		
ln. 76-77	1 BÁN 1 QA [^{ninda}] <i>pa-sí</i>	1 QA NINDA.ŠE	[1 ^{dug} ḪA]	1 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠTIN	ša É.GAL- <i>lì</i> ¹⁵	<i>a-na</i> ^ṛ _{d1} KUR EN <i>bu-ka-ri</i>	
Pattern 2							
ln. 21	1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda} <i>pa-pa-s[u]</i>	[...] NINDA.ŠE	1 ^{dug} ḪA	1 ^{dug} <i>ḫu-pár</i>	ša É DINGIR- <i>lì</i>		
Pattern 3 – Provision “for the People”							
ln. 22	½ BÁN ^{zi} <i>pa-pa-sà</i> ¹⁶	4 BÁN [NINDA.ŠE]	[4] ^{dug} PIḪÙ			<i>a-na</i> UN ^{meš}	
ln. 32	1 BÁN ^{ninda} <i>pa-pa-sí</i>	4 BÁN NINDA.ŠE	4 ^{dug} PIḪÙ	ša É.GAL- <i>lì</i>		<i>a-na</i> UN ^ṛ _{meš}	
ln. 51	[1 BÁN ^{ninda} <i>pa-pa-sí</i>]	[4 BÁN NINDA.ŠE]	[4] ^ṛ _{dug} PIḪÙ	ša É DINGIR- <i>lì</i>		<i>a-na</i> UN ^{meš} ¹⁷	
Pattern 4							
ln. 24	1 QA ^{ninda} <i>pa-pa-sà</i>	1 ^{[d]ug} <i>ḫu-pár</i>	ša É DINGIR- <i>lì</i>	<i>a-na</i> ^d NIN.URTA	SISKU[R]		
ln. 53	1 QA ^{ninda} <i>pa-pa-sí</i>	[1 ^{dug} <i>ḫu-pár</i>]	ša É DINGIR- <i>lì</i>				
Pattern 5 – Offering from the Temple of the Gods							
ln. 27-28	1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda} <i>pa-pa-sà</i>	1 QA NINDA.[ŠE]	1 ^{dug} ḪA	ša É DINGIR- <i>lì</i>	<i>a-na</i> ^d <i>ša-aš-ša-be-ti</i>	SISKUR- <i>u</i>	
ln. 50	[1 BÁN 1 QA ^{ninda} <i>pa-pa-sú</i>]	[1 QA NINDA.ŠE]	1 ^{dug} ḪA	ša É DINGIR- <i>lì</i>	<i>a-na</i> ^d KUR	SISKUR- <i>u</i>	

¹⁵ The presence of a Pattern 1 offering sourced from É.GAL suggests that É.GAL and LUGAL are interchangeable designations for the same source.

¹⁶ For the possibility that “1/2” should be interpreted as a mistake for “1” in this line, see the note to line 22, page 136. The reading of the determinative preceding *pappāsu* as ZÌ is uncertain, though is made more likely by the sure occurrence of it in line 57.

¹⁷ Very little text is preserved of the actual offering content in this instance, though the dedication of it *ana nīšī* and the break of approximately ten signs, the same number needed to supply the Pattern 3 offering, leave little doubt that it belongs in this group.

ln. 55-56	1 BÁN 1 QA [^{ninda} pa-pa-si]	[1 Q]A NINDA.ŠE	[1 ^{dug} HA]	[ša] É DINGIR-li	a-na ^d ša-aš-ša-be-ti	SIS[KUR-u]
Pattern 6 – Offering for the Palace Deities						
ln. 31	3 BÁN 3 QA ^{ninda} pa-pa-sà	3 QA NINDA.ŠE	3 ^{dug} hu-pár	3 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠTIN		a-na pa-ni-šu-nu SISKUR-u
ln. 57-58	3 BÁN 3 QA ^{zi} pa-pa-[sú/a/i]	[3 QA] NINDA.ŠE	3 ^{dug} hu-pár	[3 ^{dug} KUR ₄ .KUR ₄ GEŠ]TIN	ša LUGAL	a-na ^d NIN-É.GAL-li ^d 30 [u ^d UTU] ša É.GAL-li SISKUR
Pattern 7						
ln. 39-40	[...]	^r a ¹ -na ^{ninda} KUR ₄ .RA ^{meš}	ì ¹	3 ^{dug} PIḪÙ ^{meš}	a-na 70 DINGIR ^{[m]eš} gáb-bi [... E]-mar	i-pa-a-du
Pattern 8						
ln. 10-11	[#] BÁN NINDA.ŠE	2 ^{dug} PIḪÙ	[7 signs]	ša LUGAL	a-na gáb-bi DINGIR ^{meš}	ú-za-a-zu

*Textual and Philological Notes*¹⁸

1. The offerings of foodstuffs for the gods in the *zukru* festival are highly formulaic. It For that reason, it is possible to categorize them into distinct patterns of offerings, which are in some cases uniquely tied to a particular provider (see Table 5). Although the tablet seems to preserve the quantity “2 BÂN” in the first line, since that quantity exists in none of the offering patterns in this text, it is clear that the correct reading of the numeral is “4,” with the uppermost two wedges broken away.¹⁹ 4 BÂN is a feature only of the Pattern 3 foodstuff offering, which guarantees the restoration of the surrounding content. However, the restoration of the following line, which is certainly Pattern 1 due to the presence of [KUR₄.K]UR₄ and designation of the king as source, does not allow enough space to accommodate the necessary signs to complete the offering list started in line 1. The solution can only be that line 1 continues vertically up the margin, above the broken top of the tablet. In fact, a trace of the following N[INDA.ŠE] can be seen in the margin, though it has been mistakenly considered part of line 22, which also extends up the margin, terminating just prior to the end of line 1.

2. The great majority of offerings enumerated in the text follow fixed patterns that can be categorized and redeployed in lacunae with only the most minimal of textual cues. There are eight distinguishable patterns, three of which are attested only in a single occurrence.

¹⁸ Unless otherwise noted, the following commentary takes for granted the readings produced by Fleming’s collation of the text, represented in his selected collation notes (*Time at Emar*, Appendix E). These collations sometimes reveal drastically different sign forms from what Arnaud originally published, but since Fleming worked with both the tablet, itself, and Arnaud’s edition in hand to adjudicate, I give his readings priority. Therefore, a reading of the text based on Arnaud’s drawing alone is not possible; Fleming’s collation notes must also be consulted.

¹⁹ Fleming’s drawing (*Time at Emar*, 294) makes this possibility much clearer than Arnaud’s original.

When the source of the offering is LUGAL, the contents of the offering almost always follow Pattern 1. The exception is the king's offering to the palace deities, which contains a larger quantity to satisfy the group of three gods. Pattern 5 derives from the Temple of the Gods and always follows directly behind the Pattern 1 king's offering. It corresponds to the unique Pattern 2, also deriving from the Temple of the Gods, with the omission of the *huppar* element. It is equivalent in offering types and quantities to the first three elements of the king's offering. The offerings and their sources will be discussed in greater depth, below.

3. The restoration of SISKUR-*u* at the head of the line is uncertain, though desirable considering the space of the line. When Patterns 1 and 5 offerings occur together, they are most commonly treated together with a single verb, SISKUR-*u*, but see lines 20-21 for an example in which a verb intervenes, as would be the case here.

4. If the restoration of *ana pānī* is accepted in line 3, then a verb is suggested for the beginning of line 4. Two verbs are used in conjunction with this phrase: *alāku* and *naqû* (SISKUR). The former is associated with the procession of animal offerings (see lines 18-19, 30), which are not in evidence here.

For the ritual usage of the verb *našāru*, see Emar 393:28 “1 ^{du}gKUR₄.KUR₄ KAŠ GEŠTIN *i-na-ša-ru* [...]” Fleming's [*ú-m*]aš^l-ša-ru-šu-nu-ti is possible, though such an action is otherwise unknown in Emar ritual, except for in his reading of line 183, where the action occurs in reference to cattle that is “released” from slaughter.²⁰ Either reading

²⁰ The release of an animal (particularly a bird) is known in Mesopotamian ritual; see Or. NS 36 35 r7'; KAR 177 r. iii 35.

is riddled with uncertainty due to the preceding break, which presumably would have contained the antecedent to the 3 masc. pl. pronoun.

5. Since this line seems to introduce the first date in a series of dated 6th year preparation rites in advance of the 7th year *zukru*, the broken beginning should contain a statement analogous to that of lines 169-70: “When the sons of Emar give the *zukru* to Dagan in the 7th year, in SAG.MU of the 6th year ...” Space for such a statement is lacking, so any such idea would have to be much abbreviated.

6. Fleming’s suggestion of KÙ.GA for the traces on the main tablet²¹ is certainly possible and perhaps even likely, given the occurrence of that phrase elsewhere in the text.²² GA would be unusual in two ways: the presence of two verticals rather than three, and the placement of the verticals beneath the top horizontal.²³ As it stands, the sign better corresponds to TA, with the final vertical broken away. Since the context is unknown, I represent in this edition the reading that most easily corresponds to the preserved sign form.

Although the text is clear enough in reading “20 KÁM,” the preceding, partially broken sign is problematic, as it corresponds to nothing known to occur in the “X # KÁM” formula. In this text, the X position in that formula is only occupied by markers of time: UD, MU, and *mi* (in *u₄-mi*). Elsewhere in Emar ritual, KÁM is used in some exceptional ways, all still related to calendrical matters: 373:38 (*i-na ša-ni-ti MU.KÁM*);

²¹ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 234.

²² Cf. lines 7, 39, 48, 76, 182.

²³ Cf. line 44 for attestation of GA with two verticals.

388:13 (*i-na* 2 KÁM, though Arnaud emends to include <UD> before the numeral);
394:28 (*i-na* 2 UD.KÁM); 446:53 (*i-na ša-ni* UD.KÁM); 448:19 (*i-na* ITI.KÁM).

No cogent reading for the final word of the line is forthcoming. However, see Emar 440:4 for an offering called *zu-un-nu* TUR, which Arnaud chooses not to translate.

7. The restoration is based on line 40, which shows some similarities with the present line. For other references to “all the gods” in the same pattern see especially lines 75 and 63, among others in different syntactical forms.

The verbal restoration is also suggested by line 40, though SISKUR-*u* could be offered, as in line 50, which also deals with a SILA₄ KÙ.GA.

8. The reading of the QU sign is suspect, since that sign is only found once in this text, and there only in a DN title (^dKUR EN *qu-ú-ni*, line 98). Arnaud’s [*i-na-aq*]-*qu-šu-n*[*u-ti*] would be the only syllabic spelling of *naqû* in the text. The QU sign is frequently used in the ritual corpus for *i-laq-qu(-ú)* (or TI-*qu-šu-nu* 371:2, 8; TI-*qu* 386:23).

For the prepositional construction *iš-tu ŠÀ-šu(-nu)* in Emar ritual, see 372:9; 393:12, 13 (both with sg. suff.). The only other clear case of the unexpected singular suffix attested here occurs in Emar 393:12 (feminine –*ši*, in that case). An additional case of a singular suffix on ŠÀ in a prepositional phrase occurs in 370:17 (*i-na ŠÀ-šu*) where Arnaud translates “sur lui.”

For the use of *lā* to negate individual words, see GAG §121a. The specific phrase *la-a* KÙ.GA occurs also in Emar 369:82-83, which instructs the setting of both pure and

impure tables (*i-na ŠÀ-šu-nu 2* ^{giš}BANŠUR KÙ.GA 2 ^{giš}BANŠUR *la-a* KÙ.GA). Such an idea is likely to be contained here, given the concern for purity in the preceding line.

9. The reading *inazz[alū]*, “pour out,” is conjectural, but preferred for the parallel it provides to the use of *našāru* “pour out” at the end of the previous section (line 4).

Designation of similar actions with different verbs is characteristic of this text.²⁴ The root is attested in Mari Akkadian though never in ritual contexts. However, in the Ugaritic Kirta epic a nominal form of the root occurs in the depiction of a ritual performance.²⁵ The meaning of the word in that case is not altogether clear. It could suggest a connection to libation offerings, which would otherwise be designed by *naqû* in Akkadian, or simply refer to the mundane act of disposing of a substance through pouring.²⁶ Arnaud, Fleming, and MEDA read *inašš[arū]* “guard,” which is, epigraphically, equally likely.²⁷ Both *nazālu* and *našāru* are unknown actions elsewhere in Emarite ritual and scarcely attested in the entire corpus.²⁸

10. That preparatory rites for the *zukru* festival are hosted in the months of SAG.MU and Niqalu can be observed in lines 170 and 180.

²⁴ Such is the case, for example, with the act of anointing, called both *pašāšu* and *terû* in the text.

²⁵ KTU 1.14 III 58.

²⁶ William F. Albright already suggested that the root has ritualistic applications (“New Canaanite Historical and Mythological Data” *BASOR* 63 (1936): 28 n.24).

²⁷ Fleming translates “restrain (?)” apparently seeking to draw a connection to the restraining of sheep otherwise designated by the verb *pa’ādu* (*Time at Emar*, 235).

²⁸ Among the several alternate possibilities, a reading *i-na-as-s[a-hu]* “they will remove” might also be considered likely, since the previous line has been concerned to discuss “impure” things. But neither is this verb attested elsewhere in the rituals, and used only once in the quotidian documents (*ASJ* 13 28:22). It does occur a number of times in the canonical omen literature at Emar (e.g. Emar 611).

The offering sequence initiated at the end of the line is unique. In no other case does NINDA.ŠE begin a sequence. In only two other cases is NINDA.ŠE apportioned in a quantity measured with BÁN (line 22, 32, where the quantity is 4). The quantity cannot be restored here with confidence due to this uniqueness. The BÁN quantity of ŠE along with the following PIḪÙ suggests a Pattern 3 offering, but the i.o. of “the gods” in the following line casts doubt (not to mention the lack of *pappasu*). Lines 39-40 are comparable insofar as there is a PIḪÙ dedicated to all the gods, but otherwise is unhelpful.

12. It seems that the first entry of this section is given in a complete sentence, with its own dedicated verb. The remainder of the section, lines 12-16, simply lists the quantity of item and recipient and treats them together with a single verb in line 16.

As Fleming has noted, most of the deities in the list can be restored based on the Tier 1 deity list in 77-95 and the analogous Emar 378. ^dKUR is in both cases listed as a separate entity in addition to ^dKUR EN *bukkari*.

14. Fleming projects only an offering to the diety GÌR.UNU.GAL (or, for him, NÈ.IRI₁₁.GAL) in the initial break, thereby omitting the expected presence of Alal from this group of deities. That Alal rightfully belongs in this list is shown by the parallel god-lists of Emar 373:83 and 378:9. The broken space is sufficient for the addition of this deity if the following divine title of Rašap (EN KI.LAM) stands alone as [^d]EN KI.LAM

rather than the fuller version, GÌR.UNU.GAL EN KI.LAM.²⁹ That the titles of Rašap can stand on their own without the designation of the DN is shown in the very same line with ^dEN SI^{meš}, as well as on several other occasions in the Emar corpus.³⁰

15. The restoration of ^dNIN-É.GAL-*lì* is based on her position following ^dNIN.KUR in the hierarchical god-list (line 87) and Emar 378:13.³¹

The deity Aštartu is always designated INANNA in this text, which might suggest that ^d*Iš₈-tár* in the present line is a common noun, *ištaru*, “the goddess (of the warriors).”³² But Aštartu of Combat (*tāhāzi*) is a deity who figures prominently into the Emar ritual texts, despite her curious absence in the primary offering list of this text, making the reading of that proper name and title likely here. She appears in high position in the sacrificial lists Emar 379:1, 380:2, 381:11, and 382:6. Emar 460 describes a ritual dedicated entirely to her. There, her name is uniquely written ^dINANNA MÈ, rather than the usual ^dINANNA *ta-ḥa-zi*, though the normal orthography occurs slightly later in 460:6.³³ The writing of the DN in the present case is also unique in two ways. Firstly, 373:15 is the only case in which the name is written ^d*Iš₈-tár*, rather than ^dINANNA. ^d*Iš₈-tár* does occur as a designation of Aštartu with other titles in Emar ritual (cf. ^d*Iš₈-tár ša a-*

²⁹ Arnaud recognized the probability that EN KI.LAM stood alone in this case and that another offering recipient stood at the head of the line. He did not, however, suggest a deity to fill that place (Emar VI.3, 350).

³⁰ Cf. CM 13 19:7; Emar 381:7.

³¹ In the latter case, ^dNIN.KUR occurs as the first name in a triad with Šaggar and Halma, who are missing here. While Emar 378 resembles the *zukru* god-lists closely, it differs by elaborating the names consorts or associated deities for each entry.

³² Cf. Emar 370:43, DINGIR^{meš} *ù dIš₈-tár^{meš}-ti.*”

³³ Arnaud’s transcription reads ^dINANNA MÈ, though his line drawing attests to ^dINANNA IŠ MÈ. With no means of outside verification, it is impossible to determine which document is in error. However, the IŠ sign is difficult to integrate into the reading of the line.

bi, 452:17; ^d*Iš₈-tár* [...], 459:6).³⁴ Secondly, although Arnaud’s transcription omits it, the DN and her title in the present case are interrupted by an intervening LÚ. So rather than Aštartu of Combat, here we have Aštartu of the *man* of combat—the soldier. Whether this title is meant to be distinct from the more common Aštartu *tāhāzi* or simply a variant expression of it is unknown.

17. In the only other transition between consecutive days in this text (line 44), the month name is not repeated. Instead the phrase “on the next day,” followed by a specification of the date is employed.³⁵

18. The signs [*uš-šu-*]^rú¹ must be cramped to fit into the short initial lacuna, though this reading is strongly suggested both by the following verb *uššâ* and the parallel construction in line 197.³⁶ The standard idiom in this text is the expression of action by an impersonal third person plural, which might lead to a restoration of *ušeššû* instead (cf. lines 47 and 188).³⁷ The nominative state of the nouns DINGIR^{meš} *gabbu* and *šaššabênātu* militate against this. While case function in Emar Akkadian, in general, is quite fluid, in this text, specifically with the modifier *gabbu*, declension and grammatical state seem to be in expected correspondence (see Table 6).³⁸

The verb *uššâ* demonstrates the contraction of *i + a > â* in Emar Akkadian, as in Babylonian. See Seminara, 148.

³⁴ Arnaud transcribes ^d*Iš₈-tár ša š[u-bi]* in 373:88 (his line 78) though the reading there appears to be ^dINANNA with a preceding (erroneous?) *Iš₈*. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 242 reads only ^dINANNA based on collation, which may indicate a defect in Arnaud’s line drawing.

³⁵ Cf. Fleming’s [*i-na* ^{iti}*Ni-qa-li*] (*Time at Emar*, 236) and Arnaud’s [*i-na* *iti Za-ra-tu₄*].

³⁶ So Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 236. Cf. Arnaud’s [x x] *ú-pa-[a-du]*.

³⁷ Indeed, such a reading([*ú-še-š*]^rú¹) would fit the sign traces as well or better.

³⁸ For fluidity in case functions in Emar Akkadian, see Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 285-300 (esp. 299).

Table 6. *The Declension of gabbu in Relation to Grammatical Function*

Line	Subject	Indirect Object	Direct Object
7		<i>gabbī</i>	
11		<i>gabbī</i>	
17	<i>gabbū</i>		
34			<i>gabba</i> *
36		<i>gabbī</i>	
37		<i>gabbī</i>	
40		<i>gabbī</i>	
46			<i>gabbī</i>
63		<i>gabbī</i>	
75			<i>gabba</i> *
112		<i>gabbī</i>	
167		<i>gabbī</i>	
176			<i>gabbī</i>
179			<i>gabbī</i>
180			<i>gabba</i> *
197	<i>gabbū</i>		
199			<i>gabbī</i>

*While case function is as expected, these singular forms modify plural nouns.

19. In the few comparable examples, there is consistency between the types of offerings provided by LUGAL and URU.KI when they both provide in the same instance. In line 26, LUGAL gives UDU and URU.KI gives UDU. Likewise, in line 48, LUGAL gives SILA₄ and URU.KI gives SILA₄.³⁹ Correspondingly, the break in this line should contain an UDU offering. Since thirty-nine of the forty sheep offerings totaled in line 33 are already accounted for, the quantity must be “1.”

20. I read ^{dug}ḪA, following Fleming, who translates as “flagon,” as opposed to Arnaud’s DUG KU₆ “vase de possessions,” even though a ḪA-vessel is not known outside of Emar ritual. Elsewhere in the *zukru* text, the DUG-sign is used as a determinative for named

³⁹ The initial SILA₄ is restored, but is made certain by the following descriptor, KÙ.GA, which only refers to SILA₄ in this text.

vessels, rather than an independent designation of a unit of measured contents. Often these vessels are mentioned without specification of their contents (cf. *huppar*, *pīhu*), which suggests some fixity in the correspondence of vessel and offering material that would have been understood by the ritual practitioners.⁴⁰

22. There is every reason to suppose that ½ BÂN is an error for 1 BÂN, considering the consistency with which the Pattern 1 offering occurs. However, since the text is clear enough, I forgo emending for the sake of forcing consistency.

Inexplicably, the determinative for *pappāsu* in this case is ZĪ rather than the usual NINDA. Since the sign is not well formed for ZĪ, one is tempted simply to emend to NINDA, which occurs with great paleographic variation throughout the text. However, the unambiguous occurrence of ^{zi}*pa-pa-[sú/a/i]* in line 57 argues in favor of flexibility in the manner of determination for *pappāsu*.⁴¹

The quantity “4” for PIḪÙ is restored based on the only other preserved occurrence in line 32.

This line contains the only occurrence of the word *harṣu* in Emar 373. It occurs twice in Emar 375D (lines 3 and 4) in correspondence with the word *sikkānu* in parallel copies, which gives the impression that the two are synonymous or at least interchangeable.

⁴⁰ It is also not impossible to read ^{dug}KU₆, “fish (shaped)-vessel.” Zoomorphic vessels have been discovered at archaeological sites from LBA Syria and across the ancient Near East, including a wide range of pisciform containers and plates. At Emar, itself, one administrative record (cult inventory?) describes the accoutrement of the gods Išhara and ^dNIN.KALAM as including a ^{na4}KU₆, apparently a stone image of a fish, which suggests that fish representations were not out of place in Emar’s cults.

⁴¹ The fluctuation in determinative does not change Fleming’s translation of the word as “(barley-) mash bread.” *Time at Emar* 237. Arnaud translates the instances with ZĪ (including two more which he chooses to restore as ZĪ rather than NINDA) as “farine de gruau” as opposed to his translated of “pains de gruau” for cases with NINDA.

The end of the line is written with a vertical rise up the center margin and is augmented by the join with Emar 376. The final visible sign, much clarified in Fleming's collation drawing may simply be severely cramped, rather than drawn erroneously.⁴² In any case, the reading is assured by the fact that KÚ never occurs in this text without being followed by NAG (cf. lines 32, 57, 178).⁴³ Indeed the phrase KÚ NAG is a ubiquitous word-pair in Emar ritual.⁴⁴

Fleming's interpretation of the end of this line deserves attention since it would evidence an otherwise unattested ritual action of a somewhat radical nature. He reads "ŠÀ-šu-nu iš-tu^{na4} ħa-^rar¹-[ši (x)] UN^{meš} KÚ ina (AŠ) É(?)^{r^d(?)}]" and translates, "The people consume their [the livestock's] hearts at the ħaršu-stones. At the temple of [...]." In addition to the notes about the usual connection of KÚ and NAG, above, there are several reasons to question such an interpretation. (1) *ina* É is a dubious reading of the signs, as indicated by Fleming's question mark, especially as AŠ = *ina* occurs nowhere else in this text.⁴⁵ (2) The sentence, as Fleming understands it, would be syntactically problematic, with the object occurring prior to the subject. Even if the aberrant syntax were a mistake by a non-native Akkadian speaker, one might expect the mistaken syntax to look more West Semitic, where the subject still precedes the object. (3) The translation of "at" for *ištu* is not a nuance in evidence for the preposition.⁴⁶ (4) Fleming's estimation

⁴² *Time at Emar*, 294. Arnaud's drawing of the sign is very poor for NAG, despite the fact that Arnaud reads it as NAG in Emar 376:13. Conversely, Fleming's drawing looks like a much clearer NAG, though Fleming reads it as "*ina* (AŠ) É(?)" (236).

⁴³ The verb *akālu* occurs once without a reference to drinking in line 199, but there it is spelled syllabically (*ik-ka-lu*) and is not used to designate a ritual action but rather to provide instructions for handling the foodstuffs that are to be consumed during the festival.

⁴⁴ See, for example, Emar 369:13, et al.; 370: 33, et al.; 385:14, 37; 387: 23; 388:13 et al.; 396:10.

⁴⁵ However, AŠ is used in this way elsewhere in Emar ritual.

⁴⁶ See Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 470-75 for the senses of *ištu* in Emar Akkadian, with the expected ablative semantic range. There is a single example, however, labeled as "valori particolari" by Seminara (472) that could be comparable to Fleming's understanding. The document is TmE 91a 80:5 (not

of space in the lacuna between *harši* and UN^{mes} seems low by my calculation, though, admittedly, his direct work with the tablets may have revealed a better estimation of space to him than I am able to perceive through drawings. I suggest that the space of some 4 signs are missing—a space in which a verb would have stood to close the preceding clause, leaving the words UN^{mes} KÚ NAG to form a discrete sentence, “The people feast.” Some traces after NAG show that additional text continued past the break. Since Fleming has estimated a lacuna of 5-7 lines above the top of the Emar 376 fragment, there is plenty of room for still another complete sentence in line 22. Otherwise, the further traces could belong to the end of a previous line, such as line 1.

25. For the use of the preposition *ina* to describe motion *towards* an object or place, especially with the verb *alāku*, see Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 457.

34. For the instrumental value of *ištu* in Emar Akkadian, see Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 473.

Note *iṭarrû* for expected *iṭerrû*. For the variation between *e* and *a* in the G-stem of some III-weak verbs, see Seminara p. 120.

35. It is unusual for this text that UDU.U₈ stands alone, without a determined number.

Perhaps the number is omitted in error, or a single ewe is simply understood.

For the translation of “2 *tāpal*” as “a pair,” see the note to line 98.

from the Meskenah/Emar excavations): É-[*ta*]-š*i* [*ša*] NIN-š*i* iš-tu EDIN^{mes}, “the house of her sister in (?) the steppe.” As a single, ambiguous example, I am not inclined to invoke it for assistance in understanding the present case.

36. Fleming translates the phrase KÁ.GAL *ša qabli* as “The Great Gate of Battle” (based on *qablu* B), noting that *qablu* A, “middle,” does not usually occur as a stand-alone substantive, but rather in a construct relationship, “the middle of [noun].”⁴⁷ But the syntax is probably influenced by the West Semitic local dialect. An example to this effect is found in the Hebrew Bible’s *ša ‘ar hattāwek*, literally, “the gate of the middle,” i.e., “the middle gate” (Jer 39:3). Moreover, the root **qbl* in Akkadian is attested broadly in adjectival forms to describe city gates; e.g. AOB I 98:7 (KÁ *qa-ab-li-u*), Iraq 17 134 no. 16:19 (KÁ[!] MURUB₄-*ti*).

23. It is feasible that *ḫu-pár* could be restored in the short break near the end of the line rather than ḪA, conforming to a Pattern 6 offering rather than Pattern 1. However, Pattern 6 is only employed when the recipients are the palace deities, which is not the case here.

37. Despite Fleming’s assertion that his collation supports the reading KAŠ rather than AMAR, thus producing “the expected combination of bread and beer, against the awkward ‘calves,’ between ‘bread’ and ‘meat,’” his collation drawing still favors AMAR with its initial winkelhaken, which is not a normal feature of the KAŠ-sign in Emar cuneiform.⁴⁸ Additionally, “bread and beer” is problematic itself, since no beer has been

⁴⁷ *Time at Emar*, 93 n. 192

⁴⁸ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 253, 296. In personal communication, Fleming has emphasized that the horizontal wedges of the sign are not aligned, which is better suited for the KAŠ sign. However, other examples of AMAR can also be seen to have a less-than-straight alignment, such as the one in line 33. Additionally, the AMAR sign in that line exhibits the off-centered initial winkelhaken that is also seen here in line 37. The reading of KAŠ does not account for that winkelhaken at all.

enumerated in the foregoing text. *šikaru* can, however, designate other fermented beverages and is frequently used to refer to wine in Akkadian texts from Syria.⁴⁹

Therefore, in order to avoid the reading of AMAR, one must emend, rather than re-read, the text from AMAR to KAŠ¹ and understand KAŠ to refer, here, to alcoholic beverages or wine, generally.

But the prescription to return leftover food items to the city is preserved three additional times in the text and always includes only bread and meat (NINDA^{meš} UZU).⁵⁰ It seems that in the present case, “meat” is an appositive to “calves,” clarifying that the calves would have been slaughtered by this point in the procedure.

39. The emendation of DÙ to Ì¹ follows the suggestion of Fleming, who notes the presence of oil as a stand-alone item in an offering list in Emar 369:19.

40. Several options for interpreting *zi-ir-a-ti* present themselves, each with its own difficulties. (1) *zīrāti* < *zēru*, “seed,” though this word would normally take a masculine plural form. (2) *zīrāti* < *zarû*, active participle, “sowers.” Why a participle related to a group of LÚ would be feminine is unclear. Furthermore, the expected form would be *zārāti*. It is conceivable that the form was understood to derive from the West Semitic root *zr’* (rather than the related West Semitic term *zry*, which corresponds to Akkadian *zarû*). This perceived derivation would then have colored the vocalism to resemble other Akkadian forms that have undergone the loss of *‘ayin*. (3) Pentiuc surmises the word is a West Semitic substantive, *ōir’atu*, “seedling.” He understands the phrase in question to

⁴⁹ Cf. CAD Š2 s.v. *šikaru* mng 2c.

⁵⁰ Emar 373:184, 194, 199; 374:3.

mean “the royal offspring,” literally, “men of the ‘seedling’ of the Palace.” (4) Finally, the standard Akkadian (OB, SB) lemma *zērāti*, “hostilities, hatred,” should be noted, despite its difficult fit in the context.

42. Arnaud’s line drawing contains insufficient space for the restoration of UN^[meš] ʾū¹, which is suggested by Fleming and adopted here.⁵¹ But UN only occurs in this text with the plural determinative MEŠ (cf. lines 22, 32, 51), and, as already suggested by Fleming’s collation, Arnaud’s representation of this line is faulty.⁵²

43. Lines 41-43 contain instructions for preparing for the upcoming procession on the 21st of SAG.MU. The “others” (*allūtim*) in line 43 must refer to the foregoing processions, which this later procession will match in terms of supplies. Fleming’s suggestion that the “others” are the other (seventy) gods of the pantheon is unsustainable since it would demand a calf and lamb for every god, which would surpass the total number of calves provisioned for the festival (fifty) in line 206.

47. The contents of the initial break are mysterious since the preceding and following text make a complete and expected thought. This is especially true considering the parallel statement (for the same day and, presumably, one and the same ritual act) in lines 187-88.

⁵¹ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 238.

⁵² Fleming published an entry for this segment in his collation notes, though, due to what seems to be a printing error, the drawing is absent (*Time at Emar*, 296). His unpublished collation notes, however, demonstrate the presence of an additional vertical prior to the final vertical that Arnaud read as [N]A, suggesting the reading Ū.

49. The line must begin with a verb to complete the foregoing clause, though it is difficult to determine what action best fits the context. The restoration of *illakū* is based on comparison to lines 19 and 30, where offerings “go” before deities. However, line 31 attests to the possibility that gifts be “offered” before (*ana pānī*) deities, which might suggest a reconstruction of SISKUR here.

52-53. Unlike the other enumerations of offerings, this section does not specify a recipient, though comparison to lines 23-24 leave no doubt that it is ^dNIN.URTA who received these gifts.⁵³

54. The traces of MEŠ suggest a restoration of SILA₄ rather than UDU, which would be determined by 𒂍.A. Since this offering mirrors that of line 52, SILA₄ is suggested in that case, as well.

57-58. The offering list follows Pattern 6, which is specific to the deities of the palace. Two variations exist between this instance and that of lines 29-32: (1) *pappasu* is determined with ZĪ rather than NINDA, demonstrating that the two are interchangeable, rather than designating a different state of the offering material; (2) the offering here is *ša* LUGAL rather than *ša* É.GAL as in line 32. This shows that there is also no distinction to be made between “the king” and “the palace” as sources of offering materials.

⁵³ Fleming includes the phrase “<*a-na* ^dNIN.URTA SISKUR-*u*>” as an emendation to line 53 (*Time at Emar*, 240). Although he’s certainly correct about the intent to offer to ^dNIN.URTA, since there is no trace of anything further inscribed on the line, I abstain from offering a textual emendation.

59. Arnaud's edition numbers this line, which is inscribed on the left edge, as 212.

Fleming, however, shows that the line is a total of the foregoing section that was added after the completion of the text.⁵⁴

64. The restoration follows line 37.

66. The only case in which AMAR^{meš} occurs without a determining numeral is in the formula NINDA^{meš} AMAR^{meš} UZU *i-na* URU *e-el-^llu¹* in line 37.⁵⁵ In that case it stands at the end of the performance of a Glorification Ceremony (*kubbadu*; note that the same is reconstructed for line 64). The formula is necessarily different in this case, with the inclusion of UDU, but is likely to be a similar concluding prescription.

67 + Emar 424:3. The restoration of *ma-la a[l^l-lu-ti-im]* is based on line 43, which contains the only other clause beginning with *mala*. Arnaud and Fleming represent the *ša* sign where I have read *al^l*; in fact, the two signs are not at all dissimilar in this text. The presence of the *ša* sign's extra horizontals could be scribal error or a simply illusion created by the partial brokenness of the sign. It is also possible that the intended phrase is, instead, *mala š[a al-lu-ti-im]*, where the expressions beginning in *mala* and *mala ša* are semantically equivalent.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 253 n. 59.

⁵⁵ It is not impossible that a numeral would have stood at the end of the preceding line, though this would be the only case in the text in which a numeral is separated from the noun it determines by lineation. Furthermore, note the occurrence of the following word, UDU, without a determining quantity.

⁵⁶ Cf. CAD M1 s.v. *mala* (conj.) c (OB, Mari).

I have emended the end of the line to read *i^l-na-an-di-nu* “they will give,” from the tablet’s *a-na-an-di-nu*, which is sure to be scribal error, as already recognized by Arnaud.⁵⁷

68. The restoration is based on lines 34 and 60-61 and fits the available space exactly.

69. Noting that only 5 wedges are preserved of the number that Fleming reads as “7(?),” Masamichi Yamada suggests reading “5” instead. That number would refer to be the five “non-special” days between the important first and seventh days of the festival.⁵⁸ But his suggestion fails paleographically. The top and bottom rows of vertical wedges are aligned one on top of the other; the numeral 5 is written with the bottom row of 2 wedges centered under the top row of 3 in an inverted pyramid formation (cf. line 96).⁵⁹ So while Yamada is correct that the reading is actually “5 (+n)”, we must apply the additional parameters $10 > 5+n > 5$.

My restoration of *i-na u₄-mi-ma* “on each day” is based on the occurrence of that expression in Emar 369: 49, 51. It’s insertion here is speculative, though based on the context, which seems to prescribe Glorification ceremonies for each day of the festival.

73. The “eight Glorification ceremonies” (*ku-ba-di^{meš}*) must refer to the total number of performances of the rite during the festival: one on each of seven days plus another

⁵⁷ Arnaud, Emar VI.3, 410.

⁵⁸ Masamichi Yamada, “The *zuku* Festival in Emar: On Royal Cooperation with the City”, *Orient* 45 (2010): 116. An alleged reference to the five medial days here fits better with the outline of events that he attempts to construct.

⁵⁹ See Fleming’s drawing of Emar 376, *Time at Emar*, 296. Arnaud’s copy renders the wedges quite differently, without the possibility of a numerical value, at all.

whose timing is unknown. Glorification ceremonies also occur in the sixth year events on the 15th of SAG.MU and 25th of Niqalu.⁶⁰

74. This line is unique in the text and difficult to reconstruct with confidence. The likely restoration NU.Ú[R.MA^{me}]^s is Fleming's, based on similar offerings in Emar 452 (esp. 31-32). That text attests to the co-occurrence of pomegranates and birds, specifically doves (TU.MUŠEN), as ritual offerings. To that evidence, I add Emar 462 and 463, which, likewise, demonstrate the connection of such offerings, but with the broader term MUŠEN, as in 373:74. Emar 452 and 463 have an explicit concern with the performance of Glorification ceremonies (*kubbadu*), making them especially suggestive for the present case. In all other cases, NU.ÚR.MA is determined with a numeral (cf. 452:5, 27, 31; 462:35, 42; 463:13). This instance seems rather to be a summary remark referring to the pomegranates and birds needed for the ceremony without detailing the specific requirements.

75. Yamada has objected to the translation of UD.7.KÁM as “for seven days” based on two considerations. The first is that, elsewhere in the text, UD.n.KÁM expresses an ordinal day. Line 69, rather, shows an expression of duration (n.UD). Therefore Yamada translates “on the seventh day.”⁶¹ I offer three arguments to the contrary. (1) For

⁶⁰ Cf. also Emar 452:14, which mentions UD^{meš} *ku'-ba-da-ti*. In that text, the plural of *kubbadu* is *kubadāti*, rather than the form *kubadī*, seen here and throughout the Emar 375+ complex. The writing with KI may be a scribal error. A similar variation occurs in Emar 366:8 *ki-ba-du* compared with line 1 *ku-ba-di*. These instances, however are likely to reflect a different lemma, entirely.

⁶¹ Yamada, “The *zukru* Festival in Emar,” 116-17.

UD.n.KÁM to mean “on the nth day” it should read “*i-na* UD.n.KÁM.”⁶² The only cases in which the preposition is omitted are those in which the ordinal date has already been established through another phrase (lines 5, 187). (2) The use of UD.n.KÁM to express duration is attested elsewhere. Especially illuminating is its use in Emar 369: 49, 51, “UD.n.KÁM *i-na u₄-mi-ma*,” “for seven days, on each day.”⁶³ (3) The time designation in line 69 cannot be upheld as an example of how to express any specific temporal idea since the line is far too fragmentary to understand adequately.

The second premise of Yamada’s argument is that reading “for seven days” would yield the conclusion that all of the offerings detailed in cols. II-III are offered on each day, amounting to a sum greater than the budget of 700 lambs and fifty calves noted in line 206.⁶⁴ But this inference is not logically necessary, as the text does not specifically denote daily offerings in the same manner as, for example, Emar 369: 49, 51. Additionally, though I would not deny a connection between line 75 and the offerings that follow, there is no explicit link between the sweeping verbal action of “serving” (*palāhu*) the gods and the specific act of offering sacrifices to them. In fact, *palāhu* is not ritual verbiage; it never occurs again in the ritual texts. It is much more commonly used in legal literature to ensure that a subordinate party “serve” or “take care of” his/her superior. “Serving the gods” in line 75 is a sweeping description of the festival, not

⁶² In addition to the examples of that construction in the present text, see Daniel Fleming’s more comprehensive study, “Counting Time at Mari and in Early Second Millennium Mesopotamia,” *M.A.R.I* 8 (1997): esp. 684-85.

⁶³ This stands in contrast to Arnaud’s translation, “le septième jour, le jour meme.” Compare his translation of UD.n.KÁM in line 54, “pendant sept jours.” For a defense of understanding the phrase in Emar 369 as marking duration, see Fleming, *Installation*, 54 n.17. Fleming convincingly appeals to the occurrence of *ina ūmīma* in EA 147:7, where the meaning is “daily,” with reference to the rising sun.

⁶⁴ Yamada, *The zukru Festival in Emar*, 117.

specifically equated with the offering of the listed sacrifices, which would not have occurred daily.⁶⁵

83. For several entries in Tier 1 of the hierarchical god-list, the reconstructions of broken text offered by Arnaud and Fleming are more elaborate than those projected here, based on the longer entries of the corresponding god-list, Emar 378. The present line is an example of such a case, where both readers imagine the presence of Amaza alongside the legible name of Alal. The same is true of line 86, where both restore Šaggar and Halma after legible ^dNIN.KUR, and line 82, where Arnaud adds “^dSa_x-bit-ti” with ^dNIN.URTA. In the face of three, corresponding lists (Emar 373:11-16, 77-88, and Emar 378), the question is whether the present exemplar follows the minimal version of 373:11-16 or the maximal version of 378.⁶⁶ That the former corresponds more closely to the present list is seen clearly in the unbroken lines of the first four entries (lines 77-80). Here, only a single deity is mentioned, without the enumeration of his consort found in Emar 378. Arnaud’s addition of “^dSa_x-bit-ti” in line 82 is definitively disproved by Fleming’s collation, which shows the beginning of K[I.MIN], clearly indicating the end of the line.⁶⁷ Furthermore, the presence of uninscribed space after the writing of ^dA-lál but before the break in line 83 makes the reconstruction of ^dA-ma-za unattractive.⁶⁸ We may

⁶⁵ It may be worth considering that, rather than *palahu*, a verb *i-pa-al-[la-su]*, “to look at,” could also be restored. That verb is more commonly attested in the N-stem, though G-stem usages are also known. The effect would be to suggest either an acknowledgment of the public display of the gods, many of whom embark on procession during the festival, or the practice of a contemplation rite. The latter are well known in Ugaritic ritual (with verbal root *phy*), though always performed by the king and directed at a single deity (cf. KTU³ 1.90, 1.164, 1.168).

⁶⁶ For a useful side-by-side comparison chart of the lists, see Fleming, *Installation*, 243-244, though I take exception to some of his restorations and omissions.

⁶⁷ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 298.

⁶⁸ Alal is attested standing alone on two other occasions in the texts (Emar 380:5 382:14), though he is more frequently paired with Amaza (Emar 378:9 385:9, 447:9). Alal occurs alone in three additional

therefore characterize the *zukru* god-lists as containing only the minimal attestation of the primary deity on whose basis the entry is ranked, as opposed to Emar 378 which utilizes the same list but appends further information about the divine circles in which each ranked god associates.

96. The reading BÂN QA suggests a normal Pattern 1 offering, which means this offering is the same as the previous, with only the quantity of animal sacrifice reduced. The determining numerals have been omitted for BÂN and QA, though this may be an abbreviation of understood amounts rather than an error.⁶⁹

98. The phrase “2 *tāpal*” occurs here and in line 102 in reference to the offering portion for deities who share a line in the god-list. Although the phrase should literally indicate “two pair” of offerings—that is, four sacrificial packages for the two deities—it is clear that the phrase is instead used more loosely to note that each deity mentioned in the line receives his/her own package of offerings. In this way, “2 *tāpal*” is a redundant expression for designating a “pair”—literally “a pair of two.” That interpretation is supported by the use of the phrase for the “2 *tāpal Baliḥē*” of the Palace Garden (line 142) who are elsewhere called simply the “2 *Baliḥē*” of the Palace Garden (Emar 378:20). Since it is clear that the text uses the phrase “2 *tāpal*” in this idiomatic manner, we must also translate its occurrences in offering lists for the Glorification Ceremony as “a pair” rather than “two pair.”

occasions that involve reference to his individual cultic accessories: the priest (^{lu}SANGA) of Alal in Emar 370:110, and the temple (É) of Alal in 452:41, 50.

⁶⁹ Cf. Arnaud’s “1/2 qa” and Fleming’s “1⁷¹ QA.” Considering the striking regularity of grain offering patterns, it would be highly irregular if “1 BÂN 1 QA” were not intended.

100. Starting at this line and extending to about line 109, Arnaud's tablet drawing represents five lines of text, two oriented horizontally and three vertically, set to the right of the preserved text of col. II that are not included in the edition and translation of Emar 373. Though it is difficult to discern in the drawing, these lines are inscribed on a separate tablet fragment that was joined to the main tablet by the excavation team in the field. Arnaud later determined that it is, in fact, not related to the *zukru* text and edited it separately as Emar 453 with the excavation number Msk 74292a (*bis*).⁷⁰

One expects the phrase *kī ša* to refer back to a previous offering, as is presumably the case in line 78. But the only known titles of Dagan that fit the remaining traces are EN *da-ad-mi*, EN *Šu-(ú-)mi*, and EN *ma-aš-ša-ri*, all of which occur below the present line (lines 101, 116, and 150, respectively). Here I choose EN *da-ad-mi* due to its proximity to the present line, though the reason for making such a preemptive equation is unknown.

108-109. Arnaud's reading, “^d[H]*a-na-na*,” is not sustained by Fleming collation drawing, which shows two final winkelhakens on the broken sign.⁷¹ The reading suggested here, ^d[G]*a-na-na*, not only fits the paleographical demands but also hints at a deity with a Syrian history. Two gods, ^d*Ga-na-na* and ^dBE *Ga-na-na* are attested with some frequency in the Ebla archives.⁷² Recently, Archi has suggested that Ganana is the

⁷⁰ This observation has the effect of obviating Yamada's suggestion to incorporate some of the offset lines of the drawing into line 100 of the main text. See his “Appendix I: Forgotten Texts?” in “The *zukru* Festival in Emar,” 120-21.

⁷¹ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 298. Fleming does not suggest an alternate reading.

⁷² Francesco Pomponio and Paolo Xella, *Les dieux d'Ebla: Étude analytique des divinités éblaïtes à l'époque des archives royales du IIIe millénaire* (AOAT 245; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1997), 95-96, 144.

female consort of The Lord of Ganana (^dBE *Ga-na-na*), who derives his name secondarily from hers.⁷³ Ganana is a known participant in the ritual life of Ebla with some importance to the royal institution; her temple is involved in the ritual commemoration of the king and queen's wedding.⁷⁴ This provides some context for the specification of a Ganana "of the palace" in the *zukru* god-list.

The regional character of the Lord of Ganana, if not Ganana herself, is shown by texts mentioning the offering of gifts to his temple from the king of Mari and, indeed, the king of Imar. If the reading of Ganana's name in the present list is correct, then the cult of Ganana in inland Syria, little-attested as it is, can be considered active until the end of the Bronze Age.

120. That Adammatera is the deity who is associated with the *bīt tukli* is demonstrated by Emar 369:30-34. Here, the NIN.DINGIR initiate enters the *bīt tukli* only to offer a lamb to Adammatera before departing. No other god is known to have a specific connection to that location.

124. The text preserves only the first syllable of the divine name (^d*Mu*-[...]). Two gods in the Emar archives are candidates to fill the spot: Mušītu and Musanu. The former appears three times in the ritual corpus (Emar 472:58; 473:10; 477:1), though all are in rites for Anatolian deities. Musanu, on the other hand, appears in Emar 447:1, a local ritual text that attests to the existence of a temple for that deity alongside the mention of those of

⁷³ Alfonso Archi, "Ritualization at Ebla," *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 13 (2013):233.

⁷⁴ Alfonso Archi, "Cult of the Ancestors and Funerary Practices at Ebla" in *(Re-)Constructing Funerary Rituals in the Ancient Near East* (ed. Peter Pfälzner et al.; Qatna Studien Supplementa Bd.1; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), 17.

other, better-known local gods. Despite an almost complete lack of knowledge about the character of this deity, the reading of Musanu here seems to be the best fit, considering the local character of the rest of the list.

125. The fragment Msk 74290c, which preserves the lower right corner of the tablet, belongs at the bottom of col. II. It supplies the signs KI.MIN (or parts thereof) for 9 lines.⁷⁵ It is unclear whether the fragment joins directly to the main tablet, but Fleming makes clear that its content and physical form leave no doubt about its placement.⁷⁶

127. Cf. Emar 378:25, ^dIŠKUR EN *I-ma-ar*, the only fully preserved attestation of this divine title, which likely appears again in line 143.⁷⁷ Since in the Akkadian dialect of the Emar tablets the name of the city is always written *E-mar*, the phrase EN *I-ma-ar* must either be a more ancient appellative that preserves the older vocalization of the name or an archaizing pronunciation. That the city was called Imar in earlier periods is known from documents of the third and early second millennium from Mari, Ebla, and elsewhere.

134. As both Arnaud and Fleming have noted, the line can be restored with reference to Emar 378:41 (7 ^d*Im-li-ku* ša KÁ.GAL^{meš}). Fleming emends the number of gates in the

⁷⁵ Arnaud seems only to include 5 lines in his edition, placing them from line 129 to 133 (= his lines 119' - 123').

⁷⁶ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 255 n.125.

⁷⁷ However, cf. CM 13 27:9, which inventories vessels for one DINGIR *I-ma-ri*. Joan Westenholz suspects that the similar-sounding title DINGIR *Ha-ma-ri* in 19:1 may refer to the same deity. Cf. CM 13 p. 50; Joan Westenholz, "Emar—The City and its God" in *Languages and Cultures in Contact: At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm, Proceedings of the 42nd RAI* (ed. Karel van Lerberghe and Fabiola Voet; OLA 96; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 145.

present text to seven to harmonize with the number of gods. But since the number of gods in this case is only reconstructed and the number of gates in the parallel text of 378:41 is not specified, I feel less confident in changing the text.

For the nominal pattern *ipris*, a less common variant of *pirs*, attested in the noun *imlikū*, see GAG §56a-2a.

142. *maqālī* is likely equivalent to Akkadian *maqlūtu* “burnt offering,” though the reason for the variant patterning is obscure. Note also *maqaltānu* in ABL 633 r. 6, a West Semitic word which refers to a priest at Sam’al.

144. The beginning and bottom half of this line joins to the first line of Msk 74290d + Msk 74304a.⁷⁸ The preservation of the top half of the signs on the main tablet and the bottom half on the fragment enables the completed reading of the phrase “*a-na* ^dNIN” in the joined transcription. Arnaud counted this fragment as part of the main text, but, not recognizing the join, placed it at the bottom of col III, subsequent to both this section and the medial section of col. III that preserves only the word “*a-na*” at the beginning of thirteen lines.⁷⁹ It is this adjustment that accounts for the reduction in overall number of lines in Fleming’s text edition.

153-54. Previous translations have interpreted the phrase GAŠAN/EN *iš-pa-a-at* as “Lady/Lord of the Quiver,” reading the common noun *išpatu* that is well-attested in

⁷⁸ The correct placement was first recognized by Fleming. See *Time at Emar*, 255 n.144.

⁷⁹ Instead of drawing that section of col. III detached from its actual placement on the tablet and placing it in order of occurrence by column, as is the system for the rest of this text, Arnaud illustrates it in its actual place to the right side of col. IV on Emar VI.2 pp. 615-16.

WPA. That the word in question is rather a place-name is shown beyond all doubt by AuOrS1 6:1, which records the sale of a field located near the “Gate of Išpaḥat” (KÁ *Iš-pa-aḥ-at*^{ki}). The recognition of this geographical name in the *zukru* text alleviates two problems raised by reading a common noun: the grammatical incorrectness of the word’s occurring in the *status absolutus* when a genitival relationship is implied and the orthographic oddity of its plene A-sign. To the first point, note that elsewhere in this list, where a common noun is used as part of a divine title without the intervention of *ša*, the noun stands in the genitive case (cf. lines 147, 148, 149). As for the orthography, the writing *Iš-pa-aḥ-at* makes clear that the additional A in *iš-pa-a-at* represents a consonantal aleph.

162. Following line 162, the broken column III would have contained space for approximately forty lines, including the text of Emar 374:1-13. At least twenty of those lines must precede Emar 374:1, since as many are preserved in the adjacent column on the main tablet, thus precluding the fit of this fragment in that location. While collating this text, Fleming estimated that, in addition to those twenty lines, another fourteen should exist, corresponding to those preserved in the same location on the obverse, plus another five to seven that he estimates were lost from the top of the obverse.

374:3. NINDA^{meš} + UZU appear three other times in Emar 373, always to prescribe that they “go up into the city” at the end of a ruled section (lines 37, 64, 184). This instance breaks that pattern either by omitting the ruling that should stand below the line or by occurring in a location other than the logical end of a section.

374:4. Cf. Arnaud’s “[x x] x ba ku.” Despite the transcription, his drawing reveals that BA is only partially preserved and nothing is visible prior to it. Since KU is only used syllabically in this text for the words *il-la-ku* and *ku-ba-du*,⁸⁰ and the latter is ruled out by the proceeding signs, BA is better read as a partially preserved LA.

When the action *illakū* occurs in the text, the subject is either offerings to the gods (line 19, 30) or the gods themselves (line 165).

374:5. The end of the line is restored based on 373:200. Comparison suggests that the space of approximately four signs remaining after *sikkānāti* would have been uninscribed.

374:9. The phrase “when they feast” normally introduces the action of anointing, though it more commonly stands at the beginning of a section (cf. line 34, 60, 68). Since the context of this instance differs from the other unction-events in the text, the restoration of the contemporaneous feasting prescription is conjectural.

164. The IL-sign is used in this text only for the verb *illak(ū)*. Since the phrase “*ana līt/muḥḥi Ninurta illak*” always occurs following the passing of Dagan’s wagon (cf. lines 174-75, 183-84, 202-203), the same should stand here. This is the only case in which another sentence (“[*pa-nu-š*]u *pè-tu-u*”) intervenes between the phrases.

⁸⁰ The sole exception is *ku-ma-ri* as part of a divine title in the deity list, line 144.

165. The ŠD conjugation of the verb *rakābu* “to mount,” here, and in lines 175 and [203], is notable for being the only examples of the ŠD in the Emar corpus. ŠD forms are known in various periods of the Babylonian dialect to be restricted to poetic usages, where they usually stand in for what would otherwise be a factitive D-stem or causative Š-stem formation.⁸¹ It appears to be the latter implied here, as the participants cause the image of ^dNIN.URTA to mount and ride with Dagan. Why the verb is conjugated this way in Emar 373+ is mysterious. Seminara has speculated that the form is due to some unknown influence of literary language or even somehow affected by the substrate West Semitic dialect.⁸²

Precision in processional order is a feature known in other Emar rituals. For the use of EGIR, in particular, see Emar 369:8, 30, 45, 66, 69; 446:43, 103.

166 + 425:2. The antecedent to “that one ewe” ([1 UDU.]U₈ *ša-a-ši*) has most likely been lost in a lacuna; perhaps in the broken bottom of Column III.

171. Fleming’s collation supports the reading of the date as the 15th, though a date of the 25th is equally possible. The latter would create a correspondence to line 5, which gives a date of SAG.MU 25 immediately before transition to rites for the month of Niqualu in the sixth year. However, the further elaboration of the date in this instance as “the day of Šaggar” argues in favor of the 15th. Line 44 identifies “the day of Šaggar” as the 15th and line 187 demonstrates a connection between Šaggar and the 15th of the month. It should

⁸¹ GAG §95e.

⁸² Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 415.

be noted that “the day of Šaggar” is attested nowhere else in Emar ritual, making Emar 373:44 the only explicit expression of this designation for the 15th of SAG.MU.

176. *ul-lu-lu*, a D-stem 3 masc. pl. stative form of *elēlu*, is a rare example of the stative in the Emarite ritual literature. For the verb to be active plural (“they will purify the sheep and oxen”) as Arnaud and Fleming translate, the expected form would be *ullalū*.⁸³

177. Against Fleming’s conjectural reconstruction, “they bring out [all of the] gods,” the reading, “they will bring out [Dagan Lord of the First Fruit]” takes its cue from the parallel action in line 190.⁸⁴ In both cases, Dagan Lord of the First Fruit has already been brought out in procession and is named a second time to be brought forward for some unspecified activity. In line 190, Dagan is accompanied by Šaggar, but in the present section, the designation of Šaggar comes in the following line.

178. Compare Arnaud’s and Fleming’s reconstruction of [... *i-n*]a É^dNIN.URTA. In both of the preceding cases in which É^dNIN.URTA appears in this text (line 25, 45), it occurs in the phrase “Šaššabêttu ša bīt É^dNIN.URTA.” Doubtless, Fleming was cognizant of this when he noted that “the traces do not easily fit [š]a,” though there is nothing in his

⁸³ Such would be the case if Assyrian vowel harmony were in effect here, though that phenomenon is not known in Emar Akkadian. Juan Ikeda, noting the lack of Babylonian vowel harmony in some administrative texts from the diviner’s archive, concludes “that the scribes of our corpus were exposed to Assyrian.” But this does not seem to extend so far as to influence Assyrian-type vowel harmony in the Emar texts. “The Akkadian Language of Emar: Texts Related to a Diviner’s Family,” in *Past Links: Studies in the Languages and Cultures of the Ancient Near East* (ed. Shlomo Isre’el, Itamar Singer, and Ran Zadok; IOS 18; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1998), 41-42. Cf. also Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 143-148. For the rare instances of Assyrian vowel harmony in the Akkadian of Ugarit, see John Huehnergard, *The Akkadian of Ugarit* (HSS 34; Atlanta: Scholar’s Press, 1989), 107.

⁸⁴ Cf. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 249.

collation note to suggest any such difficulty (cf. esp. ŠA in lines 21 and 23).⁸⁵ However, since Fleming and Arnaud worked directly with the tablet in contrast to my work with only their drawings, my conclusion must remain provisional.

180. Although the progression of sixth-year dates was given in lines 5-16 as moving from SAG.MU to the twenty-fourth of Niqalu, the nature of the rites in this section suggest a movement directly to the twenty-fifth. The procession described in lines 180-181 corresponds to that of lines 17-18 and the sacrifice of calves and pure lambs in 182-183 fits with the offerings of 18-22 and the ensuing feast. If the nature of the second half of the text is more concerned with describing ritual action, as opposed to administrative preparations, the omission of the twenty-fourth of Niqalu, which is only concerned with the designation of victims for slaughter on the twenty-fifth, is not surprising.

183. The verb *qatāru*, “to cause something to smoke, to make an incense offering,” is not used in standard Akkadian to designate the burning of an animal carcass.⁸⁶ However, its West Semitic cognate (*qṭr*) is widely used in the Hebrew Bible for burning offerings for deities and specifically (in the “official” cult) for turning a part or the whole of a sacrificial animal into smoke.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 256, 299.

⁸⁶ See CAD Q s.v. *qatāru* mng 3.

⁸⁷ E.g. Lev 1:9, 13, 15, 17; 4:10; 8:20. In the Hebrew Bible, the D-stem of the root usually refers in a general way to unsanctioned sacrifice. In the “official” cult, where the references to the burning of animals are made explicit, the verb is always in the C-stem.

189. The sacrifices “written on the tablet” likely refers to the detailed offerings enumerated in Part I of this very text, which means that “the tablet” is self-referential.

197. For lines 197-198, neither Arnaud nor Fleming indicate that any text should stand in the lacuna prior to the end of the column. The text does make sense without any interpolations, but it should be noted that nearly all of the visible lines in col. IV extend to the very end of the column, or even overlap the margin. Here I restore line 197 based on the same expression in line 189. The restoration in of line 198 takes into account the vast majority of instances of “DINGIR^{meš}” in this text that occur in conjunction with a form of *gabbu*.

199. Although Fleming’s collation of the text clarified that the final sign before the break begins with two winkelhakens, it is clear from the parallel expression now added to the bottom of column III (Emar 374:5-6: *ša É^{hi.a} ù ša be-ra[-at^{na4.meš} si-ka-na-ti] / i-na-aš-šu-ni-ma i-na tu-ur-ti [...]*) that the sign should be emended to É.

200. The presence of a suffixal *-mi* on the verb *inaššûmi* is unexpected. Enclitic *-mi* in Emar Akkadian, as in core Akkadian, is commonly used as a signifier of direct speech, though such is clearly not the case here.⁸⁸ Seminara treats this and three other “aberrant” uses of *-mi* together in a distinct category:

Le attestazioni sono troppo poche per trarre conclusioni circa la sua natura e il suo contenuto semantico. Un suffisso *-mi* con valore enfatico è comunque documentato nei testi accadici della periferia occidentale d'età amarniana, in aree di lingua semitico-occidentale e, soprattutto, hurrita (Izre'el 1991, pp. 330-333). È pertanto possibile che anche il suffisso *-mi* dei nostri testi vada annoverato tra

⁸⁸ See GAG §123c. Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 581-85. Ikeda, “Akkadian Language of Emar,” 58.

questi casi (quantunque, più che una funzione enfatica, mi pare di avervi riconosciuto un valore di coordinazione simile a quello dell'enclitica *-ma*) e considerato esito di un'influenza (forse involontaria, vista l'esiguità del numero di attestazioni) di sostrato o parastrato.⁸⁹

The attestations are too few to draw conclusions about its nature and its semantic content. A suffix *-mi* with emphatic value is already documented in the Akkadian texts of the western periphery of the Amarna age, in Semitic-speaking areas in the west and, above all, Hurrian (Izre'el 1991, pp. 330-333). It is therefore possible that the suffix *-mi* of our texts should be counted among these cases (although, more than an emphatic function, it seems to me legitimate to recognize a value of coordination similar to that of enclitic *-ma*) and consider the outcome of substrate or parastrate influence (perhaps unintentional, given the small number of cases).

It is the conjectured coordinating function that is reflected in Seminara's translation of Emar 373:200: "prendono su quanto/chi si trovi tra i betili, ma al loro ritorno nulla può salire in città" ("they will take whatever/whomever is between the *betyls*, but on their return nothing may go up into the city").⁹⁰ This reading follows Arnaud's reconstruction of the broken end of the line as "*i-na tu-ur-ti-[šu-nu]*," which is shown to be incorrect by comparison to the completed phrase in Emar 374:9 ("*i-na tu-ur-ti i-šak-ka-nu*").⁹¹ Nonetheless, disjunction may best fit the context, if the meaning is that the offerings are removed from the stones but disposed of somewhere between that location and the city. The parallel phrase in Emar 374:6 lends plausibility to this interpretation by expressing it with *-ma* (*i-na-aš-šu-ni-ma i-na tu-ur-ti [...]*).

The many valences of the verb *šakānu* cloud its precise meaning here. I suspect that "placing," i.e. setting it down, is meant to be the antithesis of the preceding verb "to lift up" (*našû*).⁹² That the meat and bread should be "set down" after being "lifted up" is

⁸⁹ Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 526.

⁹⁰ Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 526.

⁹¹ The comparison is recognized and correctly restored by Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 257.

⁹² CAD Š1 s.v. *šakānu* mng. 1i.

suggested by the following phrase, “Nothing will go up into the city.” Hence the line deals with the disposal of ritual goods.

205. The clause “when the Emarites (verb)” is a standard expression used to introduce a set of ritual instructions (see Table 7). Already the text has described the festival timeline twice, once with a sacrificial focus and once with an eye toward ritual performance. That a new introduction is encountered here suggests yet a third enumeration, though there would have been insufficient room on the tablet to include another section comparable in length to the first two. From collation, Fleming estimated space for fourteen to sixteen lines after line 205 (eight of which are represented in part by Emar 374:14-21).⁹³ It is possible that this short third textual sub-unit contained something like a *résumé* version of the foregoing procedures or condensed summation of ritual offerings, similar to the summary contained in some Hittite ritual texts.⁹⁴

Table 7. “*When the Emarites...*”

Text	Transcription
Emar 369A:1-2	<i>e-nu-ma</i> DUMU ^{meš} ^{uru} <i>E-mar</i> NIN.DINGIR <i>a-na</i> ^d ISKUR <i>i-na-aš-šú-ú</i>
Emar 373:169-70	[<i>e-nu-m</i>]a DUMU ^{meš} ^{kur} <i>E-mar</i> <i>i-na</i> MU.7.KÁM ^{meš} ^{ezen} <i>zu-uk-ra</i> [<i>a-na</i>] ^d KUR <i>i-na-an-di-nu</i>
Emar 375A:1-2	<i>i-nu-ma</i> ^{uru} <i>E-mar</i> ^{ki} [... <i>zu-uk-r</i>]a <i>i-na</i> ^d <i>Da-gan</i> <i>i-na-di-nu</i>
Emar 385:2	<i>e-nu-ma</i> LÚ ^{meš} DUMU ^{meš} ^{uru} <i>Ša-tap-pí</i> ^{ezen} <i>ki-is-sà</i> <i>a-na</i> ^d KUR <i>ip-pa-šu</i>
Emar 392:2	<i>e-nu-ma</i> <i>i-mi-iš-ta</i> <i>e-pu-šu-ma</i>

⁹³ Emar 374:14-21 do not correspond to any existing lines of 373 col. IV and there is no trace of the double ruling above 373:205 on Emar 374. Therefore, all eight lines must be situated in the entirely broken bottom.

⁹⁴ E.g. *KBo* 10 31, which contains a summary list of rations for the KI.LAM festival. Cf. Itamar Singer, *The Hittite KI.LAM Festival: Part One* (StBoT 27; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), 143.

The zukru Ritual in its Festival Version

The *zukru* festival text is an imposing and detailed piece of ritual literature. Despite its broken state, thanks to reassembled fragments and formulaic phrases that can be restored with confidence, the text is reasonably near to completion. At least part of what emerges is an image of a ritual document that is truly administrative in nature. That is to say, a primary reason for the writing of this text seems to have been to ensure the proper distribution of ritual goods and correct performance of ritual actions at the time of the event's actual observance. Indeed, such may be the case for all Emarite ritual documents, but it is uniquely enshrined in the very structure of Emar 373+. The text is organized into three well-defined parts: Part I, lines 1-168; Part II, lines 169-204; and Part III, lines 205, 374:14-21, 206. Parts I and II offer parallel accounts of the same ritual days, the key difference between them being the topical focus of each section. Part I gives details and timing for the sacrificial donations to be given to each deity who is served during the festival. The long, hierarchical god-list is a part of this sacrificial accounting; it is the presence of that list that results in Part I's extreme length.

Part II is action-oriented. It records the necessary ritual actions and their appropriate timing over the festival period. It begins anew with the first day of festival preparations, just as Part I has already done, offering new data for the same days.

Part III is almost completely broken, though its opening line shows that it yet again begins discussing the festival from the start. The tablet's space limitations require that Part III be much shorter than the other two, so it is unlikely that it would detail the whole event a third time. More likely it offers summary remarks about the event that

were not fit into either of the preceding sections, before concluding with the final summation of sacrificial offerings given throughout the entire festival.⁹⁵

This multilayered progression through time is a great benefit for reading and understanding the text since each part contains information that fills in the gaps of the other. On some points, as the analysis of this chapter will show, the synoptic view of the text is crucial for interpreting elements of the *zukru*, so it is given here in tabular form (Table 8) for ease of reference.

At its core, the septennial festival version of the *zukru* ritual is of a piece with the shorter *zukru* attested in Emar 375+. The nucleus of the event is the visit of Dagan to a place, now identified as a gate, of *sikkānu*-stones, where ritual events unfold, timed to correspond with the emergence of the year's first full moon on the 15th day of the first month, lasting through to the 21st. The festival version of the ritual, however, has been embellished dramatically. Noticeably, it has added preparatory ritual days in the first two months of the year preceding the main event. These days initiate the “season” of the *zukru* festival, surely a much anticipated event, and witness ritual activities much the same as those performed during the festival, itself. The primary purposes of these days are to commence the veiling rite of Dagan, which will last for the entire year, and to offer some preliminary sacrifices to the most important gods of the city.

⁹⁵ An analogue for the division of the text into separate foci may be found in the Hittite festival texts, which, in Itamar Singer's characterization, contain three major components: (1) step-by-step description of rites, (2) script of spoken liturgy, and (3) detailed logistical notes concerning preparations for offerings, including suppliers and participants (*The Hittite KILLAM Festival: Part One*, 52). If that same sensibility is at work in the *zukru* festival text (see Chapter 5), we might conjecture that Part III of Emar 373+ would have contained liturgy, since that is the only category not already represented. Emar ritual texts almost never record ritual utterances (Emar 370:83-84 is a notable exception), so were it the case that Emar 373+ contained a liturgical section, the text would be unique in doing so. Nothing in the sparsely preserved text of Part III especially points in that direction.

Also conspicuous is the fact that the *zukru* festival has expanded the involvement of the gods to include what seems to be the entire divine population of the Emar region, including several gods with key roles who were unknown in the shorter text. Not unrelated to that development is the dramatic increase in the ritual's inventory of sacrificial animals, not to mention offerings of other types of foodstuffs. All those gods, after all, had to be fed. Consequently, the septennial *zukru* festival incurred expenses unmatched by any other Emarite ritual event. It was sure to have been the largest and most elaborate public event in Emarite religious life.

zukru Festival Divinity

Although a great many gods are earmarked for receipt of sacrificial offerings during the *zukru* festival, a small group of deities stands out above the rest. In fact, the long first part of this bipartite text is occupied primarily with enumerating donations to these gods. The members of this group received greater quantities of offerings than any other deities and the timing of their donations came at important junctures: on the 25th of Niqalu in the sixth year and on the 15th of SAG.MU in the seventh year—both the primary days of ritual activity in each year that the festival treats. Providing offerings to this small cadre of gods was one of the most central acts of the *zukru* festival and, correspondingly, it must be treated as fundamental to the *zukru* in its festival form. It is not the case, however, that all the deities of this group play visibly active roles in the rites prescribed for the festival, listed in Part II of the text. That distinction is reserved for Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA, alone. The primacy of Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA no doubt follows from the appearance of those two deities—and perhaps no others—in the older *zukru*

ritual recorded in Emar 375+. In its expanded form, the *zukru* festival preserves the priority of these gods, though, as we will see, it gives them new ritual roles to play. Šaššabêttu and the gods of the palace, ^dUTU, ^d30, and Bēlet-ekalli, are not seen enacting any performances in the ritual outside of receiving their special offerings, though their connection with offerings to Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA make clear their important status.⁹⁶ These gods—at least in the form in which they appear here—are not known anywhere outside of the festival form of *zukru* and the few related sacrificial lists and so they are ill-understood. The following discussion aims to shine a light on this small group of deities in their special manifestations as *zukru* gods and concludes by attempting to consider them together as a cohesive unit that is fundamental to the new *zukru* practice.

Like Emar 375+, the text of Emar 373+ locates the center of the festival as the worship of Dagan. The event itself is described as an offering to the god: the citizens of the city “give the *zukru* festival to Dagan” (lines 169-170). That much is unsurprising, since, after all, he was the traditional chief god of Middle Euphrates region and the *zukru* festival was Emar’s premier religious event. But what is peculiar about Dagan in the *zukru* festival is that he plays his role in a specific manifestation—that is, with the distinct title—as *bēl bukkari*, “the Lord of *bukkaru*.” That epithet is found only in texts related to the *zukru* in its festival version: eleven times in Emar 373+⁹⁷ and twice in the sacrificial list Emar 378, though the text is partially broken in both cases.⁹⁸ The title is altogether

⁹⁶ Some additional ritual action is implied for Šaššabêttu and Šaggar, who are seen emerging from the *bīl dug-li* on the 15th of SAG.MU in the sixth year preparation events. The exact nature of their action at that location is not specified.

⁹⁷ One instance is confidently reconstructed and two occur in the indirectly joined portion of Emar 374.

⁹⁸ It is possible that the Emarite PN *BU-QA-ru* could be connected to the lemma under consideration, though there is no evidence with which to adjudicate. See RE 11:4, Emar 129:4 and possibly *BU-UK-[KA-ru(?)]* in Emar 114:12. The latter, however, may be more likely to correspond with the PN *Buqmu*, written *bu-uq-^rme¹* in Emar 65:23 and *bu-uq-mi* in 337:16.

Table 8. *A Synoptic Presentation of the zukru Festival Text*

Date	Part I	Part II
Year 6 15 th of SAG.MU	<p>[...]</p> <p>1. [... 1 <i>seah</i> of porridge-]bread, 4 <i>seah</i> of b[arley bread, 4 <i>pīhu</i> for the people.]</p> <p>2. [1 <i>seah</i> 1 <i>qa</i> of porridge-bread, 1 <i>qa</i> of barley bread, 1 ḪA-vessel, 1 <i>kurk</i>]urru from the king to Dagan</p> <p>3. [they will offer. 1 <i>seah</i> 1 <i>qa</i> of porridge-bread, 1 <i>qa</i> of barley bread, 1 ḪA-vessel from the Temple of the Gods before] Dagan</p> <p>4. [they will offer. ...] they will pour(?) them out.</p>	<p>169. [When] the Emarites give the <i>zukru</i> festival in the 7th years</p> <p>170. [to] Dagan Lord of the First Fruit, in the 6th year, in the month of SAG.MU</p> <p>171. [on the 15th day,] on the day of Šaggar, they will bring out Dagan Lord of the First Fruit,</p> <p>172. his face unveiled. The minor Glorification at the Gate of the <i>sikkānu</i>-Stones</p> <p>173. they will perform before him. When they feast, they will veil his face.</p> <p>174. The wagon of Dagan will pass between the <i>sikkānu</i>-stones.</p> <p>175. It will go to ^dNIN.URTA. They will mount ^dNIN.URTA up with him,</p> <p>176. their faces veil[ed. On] that same day, the oxen and sheep are pure.</p> <p>177. On that same day, they will bring out [Dagan Lord of the First Fruit]. Before evening they will bring out</p> <p>178. Šaggar [and Šaššabêttu o]f ^dNIN.URTA's temple from the <i>bīt dug-li</i>.</p> <p>179. [The bread and meat in front of the gods]—all of it will go up into Emar.</p>
Year 6 25 th of SAG.MU	<p>5. [...] x x [in the sixth year, in the month of] SAG.MU, on the 25th day</p> <p>6. [...] x x [...] twentieth(?) [...]</p>	

Year 6 25 th of SAG.MU (continued)	<p>7. [...] pure lam[b(s) for all the gods of] Emar [they will restrain(?).]</p> <p>8. [...] xx [...] from within it imp[ure(?) ...]</p> <p>9. [...] they will pour out(?).</p>	
Year 6 24 th of Niḫalu	<p>10. [In the month of Niḫalu] on the 24th day [#] <i>seah</i> of barley bread, 2 <i>pīḫu</i></p> <p>11. [...] from the king they will distribute among all the gods.</p> <p>12. [One sheep for Dagan Lord of the First Fruit] they will restrain. One sheep for ^dIŠKUR, one sheep for UTU,</p> <p>13. [one sheep for Dagan, one sheep] for Ea, one sheep for Šaggar, one sheep for ^dNIN.URTA</p> <p>14. [one sheep for Alal, one sheep for the] Lord of Commerce, one sheep [for] the Lord of the Horns, one sheep for ^dNIN.KUR,</p> <p>15. [one sheep for Bēlet-ekalli,] one sheep for Aštartu of the Soldier; these sheep</p> <p>16. [...] they will restrain.</p>	
Year 6 25 th of Niḫalu	<p>17. [On the next day,] on the 25th [day], all the gods and the <i>šaššabēnātu</i></p> <p>18. [will go out...] Dagan Lord of the Brick will go out, his face veiled. Two calves and six sheep</p> <p>19. from the king and [one sheep from] the city will process before Dagan.</p> <p>20-21. (<i>List of offering materials for Dagan</i>)</p>	<p>180. In the month of Niḫalu [on the 25th day Dagan Lord] of the First Fruit and all the gods</p> <p>181. they will bring out to the Gate of the <i>sikkānu</i>-Stones, [his fa]ce veiled for his departure</p> <p>182. and his return. From that same day, the calves and pure lambs</p>

<p>Year 6 25th of Niḡalu (continued)</p>	<p>22. ½ <i>seah</i> of porridge meal (?), 4 <i>seah</i> [of barley bread, 4] <i>pīḫu</i> for the people. 1 calf (and) <1> pure lamb they will offer to Dagan. From among them⁽¹⁾ the <i>ḥarṣu</i>-stones [...] The people will feast [...] 23-32. (<i>List of offering materials for ^dNIN.URTA, Šaššabêttu, and the gods of the palace.</i>)</p> <p>33. Total: 4 calves, 40 sheep for the Consecration</p> <p>34. When they feast, they will rub all the stones with oil and blood.</p> <p>35. (With) a ewe, a pair of thick loaves, porridge-bread, 1 <i>ḥuppar</i> from the king in front of</p> <p>36. the Central City Gate they will perform the Glorification Ceremony for all the gods. That ewe</p> <p>37. they will burn for all the gods. The bread, the calves—(that is,) the meat—will go up into the city.</p>	<p>183. by the bronze(?) knife they will send up as smoke offerings(?). The wagon (of Dagan) will pass between the <i>sikkānu</i>-stones.</p> <p>184. It will go to ^dNIN.URTA. The bread and the meat in front of the gods</p> <p>185. will go up into the city.</p>
<p>Year 7 14th of SAG.MU</p>	<p>38. In the next year they perform the <i>zukru</i> festival. In the month of SAG.MU</p> <p>39. on the 14th day, seventy pure lambs from the king [...] for thick loaves, oil</p> <p>40. 3 <i>pīḫu</i> for all seventy gods of Emar they will restrain. They will give seven sheep from among them to the seven <i>zirāti</i>-men of the palace.</p> <p>41. 1 calf, 1 lamb they will restrain for Dagan Lord of the First Fruit. On a later day</p> <p>42. of the <i>zukru</i> festival, the people and the gods will go out a second time—</p> <p>43. as many (provisions) as (for) the other (processions) they will restrain.</p>	<p>186. In the next year, in the month of SAG.MU, on the 14th day, they will distribute the restrained lambs</p> <p>187. among the gods.</p>

<p>Year 7 15th of SAG.MU</p>	<p>44. On the next day, on the 15th day, on the day of Šaggar, they perform (it). 45. Dagan Lord of the First Fruit, NIN.URTA, Šaššabêttu of NIN.URTA's temple 46. [Bēlet-ekalli,] ^d30, ^dUTU of the Palace, all the gods and the <i>šaššabeyānātu</i> 47. [before evening(?)] they bring out to the Gate of the <i>sikkānu</i>-Stones. 48. [(...?) # calves, #] pure [lamb(s)] from the king and 10 lambs from the city before Dagan 49. [will process(?). 49-50. (<i>List of offering materials for Dagan.</i>) 51. [1 <i>seah</i> of porridge-bread, 4 <i>seah</i> of barley bread, 4] <i>pīhu</i> from the Temple of the Gods (are) for the people. 52-58. (<i>List of offering materials for ^dNIN.URTA, Šaššabêttu, and the gods of the palace.</i>) 59. Twelve calves for the gods [...] 60. [Whe]n they feast, the <i>sikkānu</i>-Stones with oil and blood 61. [they will an]joint. Before evening they will bring up the gods into the city. 62. [In front of] the Central City Gate they will perform the minor Glorification Ceremony. 1 ewe, 1 <i>huppar</i>, 63. [A] pair of porridge-loaves [from] the king they will burn for all the gods. 64. [The breads (and) me]at go up [into the city]. 65 + Emar 424:1. [...] all the gods [...]</p>	<p>187. The next day, the 15th, Šaggar(-day), Dagan Lord of the First Fruit, 188. and all the gods (and) <i>šaššabeyānātu</i> they will bring out to the Gate of the <i>sikkānu</i>-Stones. 189. The face of Dagan is veiled during his departure. They will give the sacrifices according to what is written on the tablet 190. to the gods. On that very same day, they will bring out Dagan, visible, and Šaggar. 191. Also the bread of Šaggar of all the city of Emar will go up. Before evening 192. Dagan will pass between the <i>sikkānu</i>-stones. They will veil his face. 193. At the Central City Gate they will perform the rites just like the Consecration Day. 194. The bread (and) meat in front of the gods will go up into the city.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Year 7 15th of SAG.MU (continued)</p>	<p>66 + Emar 424:2. [a]ll the calves, sheep (and) all the wine [...] 67 + Emar 424:3. As many (provisions) as for [the other (processions)] they will give. 68-74. (<i>Text severely broken.</i>) 75. For the seven days of the <i>zukru</i> festival they will worship all the gods of Emar. 76-162. (<i>The hierarchical god-list.</i>)</p>	
<p>Year 7 21st of SAG.MU</p>	<p>374:1. [...] 374:2. [...] in front of [...] 374:3. [...] the bread (and) meat will go up into the city [...] 374:4. [...] they will] go and all [the gods ...] 374: 5. from the temples and from bet[ween the <i>sikkānu</i>-stones (...)] 374: 6. they will pick up and during the return [...] 374: 7. and if the calf (and) lamb are from [...] 374: 8. whether from the palace or [...] 374: 9. they will place (them) during the return. [When they feast, the <i>sikkānu</i>-stones] 374: 10. they will rub with blood and oil. [...] during(?)] 374: 11. the return they will perform. [...] 374: 12. from the <i>nupuhannū</i> -men [...] 374: 13. prior to the retu[rn ...] [...] 163. [...] the wagon [of Dagan will pass b]etween the <i>si</i>[<i>kkānu</i> stones.]</p>	<p>197. On the 7th day, Dagan and all the gods (and) <i>šaššabeyānātu</i> will go out. [During his departure(?)] 198. his face is veiled. They will give the rite to [all] the gods just as (for) the previous day. 199. All the meat (and) bread—anything which they should eat—from the temple[s] 200. and from [between] the <i>sikkānu</i>-stones they will pick up and during the return [they will place.] 201. No[thing] will go up [into] the city. When the fire in [...] 202. [...], they will unveil the [fa]ce of Dagan. The wagon of Dagan will pass [between] 203. [the <i>sikkānu</i>-stones]. It will go to ^dNIN.URTA. [They will mount ^dNIN.URTA up with him.] 204. They will perform the rite just as (for) the previous day.</p>

<p>Year 7 21st of SAG.MU (continued)</p>	<p>164. [his face] is unveiled. He will go to ^dNIN.URTA. [...^dNIN.URTA] 165 + 425:1. they will mount up with him. The gods will go behind him. On [that very day(?)] 166 + 425:2. they will arrive [at the Central City G]ate. They will perform the minor Glorification Ceremony. That 1 [ew]e, [a pair] of thick porridge loaves, 167 + 425:3. [1 <i>huppar</i>] from the king they will [burn] for all the gods. (With) the sheep fat they will anoint the stones. 168 + 425:4. [... of t]amarisk they will [sm]ear upon the gods [...]</p>	
---	--	--

absent from the earlier *zukru* ritual reflected in Emar 375+. The manifestation of Dagan as *bēl bukkari* in Emar 373+ (and 378) is an innovation, either by the creation of an entirely new aspect of the god or by incorporating a preexisting manifestation into the *zukru* festival format. In either case, this aspect of the god is at the core of *zukru* practice, so much that we should think of Emar's *zukru* in its festival version as inextricably related to the *bukkaru* aspect of Dagan. The interpretation of other elements of the ritual, which are only tersely described, will necessarily follow from the primary issue of the god's nature. In this way, understanding Dagan *bēl bukkari* is the key to understanding the significance of the *zukru* festival for its participants.

Dagan *bēl bukkari* is the deity of first mention on the most important days of both the festival event, itself, and the prior-year preparatory rites.⁹⁹ His residence must have been within the city, since, like the other gods, he was brought out from there in order to process to the extramural Gate of *sikkānu*-Stones, though whether he enjoyed his own permanent temple or shrine in the city is unknown. In accordance with his primacy in the ritual, which is, after all, “given” to him, his offering portions easily outweigh those of even the other highly exalted gods. When an additional cohort of deities receives an offering prior to the main ritual in the preparatory year, Dagan *bēl bukkari* stands at the head of their list. When the long, hierarchical list of sacrifices appears, recording offerings for the medial days of the festival, Dagan *bēl bukkari* is given priority, yet again. Likewise, in the sacrificial list Emar 378, this manifestation of the god stands in the first place, with his consort listed next.¹⁰⁰ Dagan *bēl bukkari* is also the actor who was

⁹⁹ On the 25th of Niqulu in the preparatory year, the god is called, rather, Dagan *bēl* SIG₄. This variation is discussed below, pages 179-181.

¹⁰⁰ Emar 378:2 reads ^dNIN.LÍL ^dKUR EN *bu-k[a-ri]*, which Arnaud misinterpreted as naming two separate deities (*Emar VI.3*, 373). Dagan *bēl bukkari*, himself, was listed in line 1; this line is a genitival

assigned active ritual performances. He took part in rites of veiling and unveiling his face, perambulated the *sikkānu*-stones in his vehicle, and directed his movements towards ^dNIN.URTA, whom he welcomed into his vehicle for the return to the city.¹⁰¹

For all his fundamental importance to the core nature of the festival, the actual meaning of Dagan's title in this manifestation has been a matter of uncertainty. Arnaud interpreted it with a West Semitic etymology, translating the epithet as "seigneur des bovins."¹⁰² Though no lemma *buqaru* exists in standard Akkadian, such a word is used once in the Akkadian of Mari.¹⁰³ However, in the sole instance in which the root **bqr* is used to designate cattle at Emar, the vocalization is *baqara*.¹⁰⁴ And, orthographically, the writing of *bu-KA-ru* to spell */buqaru/* requires that KA = *qā*, which—as already noted by Fleming—is an extremely rare sign value in Emar Akkadian, probably to be read only

construction that associates another deity with him in a consort relationship: ^dNIN.LÍL of Dagan *bēl bukkari* (see also Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 89 n. 174). Dagan's consort is normally ^dNIN.KUR at Emar. Fleming suggests that this list reflects a more Mesopotamian characterization of the pantheon, based on the name of this consort and that of Ea's consort, given as Damkianna. But we should not overlook the fact that this list is the only instance in which consorts are given for Dagan *bēl bukkari* and for Ea. It may not be a coincidence, then, that these are the only times that these two names, ^dNIN.LÍL and Damkianna, appear in Emar. Dagan *bēl bukkari* might be seen as having a different consort than Dagan.

¹⁰¹ Each of these rites is discussed in detail in pages 257-58..

¹⁰² Cf. the West Semitic words for "cattle," Hebrew *bāqār*, Aramaic *baqrā'*, Arabic *baqar*. This interpretation has been followed by a number of subsequent readers of the text. So Pentiuc, *West Semitic Vocabulary*, 36-37; Mark Cohen, *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East* (Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 1993), 346; Ran Zadok, "Notes on the West Semitic Material from Emar," 116; Volkert Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (HdO I.15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 571-72; Daniel Schwemer, *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen: Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 561.

¹⁰³ ARM 2 131:39, *bu-qā-ru*. This case helps to alleviate the problem of the *u::a* vowel pattern, which stands against the unanimous *qatal* pattern attested in the cognates

¹⁰⁴ Emar 327:9. Note the *a::a* vowel pattern, which is expected based on the cognate data, and the orthography using the QA-sign (*/qa/*) rather than KA (*/qā/*), as Emar 373+ would demand. There is some evidence for variation between *a* and *u* in Emar noun patterns that could allow both lemmata to exist, designating the same idea; cf. Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, 136-38. Jean-Marie Durand denies the presence of the word in Emar 327, reading *ša^m Ma-qa-ra* for Arnaud's *ša ina ba-qa-ra* (review of *Recherches au Pays d'Aštata, Emar VI, Textes sumériens et accadiens, vol. 1, 2 et 3* by Daniel Arnaud, *RA* 84 (1990): 84). For the PN *Maqara*, cf. Emar 336:65. Durand does not explain, however, how *ina* (= AŠ) is to be interpreted as the *personenkeil* (= DIŠ). *Contra* Durand, see also Pentiuc, *West Semitic Vocabulary*, 36.

nine times in the entire corpus.¹⁰⁵ In the text of Emar 373+, itself, the KA-sign is in all other cases to be read /ka/.¹⁰⁶ These considerations argue in favor of a II-*k* root.¹⁰⁷

Accordingly, Fleming saw the term as derived from the Akkadian noun *bukru* “child,” yielding an aspect of Dagan as “Lord of the Offspring.”¹⁰⁸ In this way, Fleming developed a picture of Dagan as progenitor. Lluís Feliu independently advocated this position in his monograph on the god Dagan, emphasizing that the “offspring” referenced in the title must be lower gods and “lord” implies Dagan’s role as their father.¹⁰⁹ The title would be a reference to Dagan’s divinely paternal nature, which is putatively reinforced by his designation elsewhere in Emar 373+ as Dagan *abumma*, which he translates “the very father,”¹¹⁰ and perhaps also by *bēl qūni*, “Lord of Creation.”¹¹¹ For the idea of Dagan as father-god, Fleming has pointed to Old Babylonian Mari, where Dagan is called

¹⁰⁵ Emar 274:7, where /qa/ is suggested by 452:15; 91:36 (PN), where /qa/ is suggested by comparison to AuOrSI 44:18; RE 60:8, 12 (PN), where /qa/ is suggested by comparison to Emar 118:1, 16; 446:42; 537:42, 175. Pentti, with reference to Jun Ikeda, “A Linguistic Analysis of the Akkadian Texts from Emar: Administrative Texts” (PhD diss., Tel Aviv University, 1995), 284, notes that the value *qā* is an acceptable reading for KA at Emar, but fails to consider the extreme paucity of evidence (*West Semitic Vocabulary*, 37).

¹⁰⁶ This caution has not deterred Mark Cohen, who has recently revived the notion that this Dagan was a Lord of the Cattle (*Festivals and Calendars of the Ancient Near East*, 333).

¹⁰⁷ The likelihood of KA = *ka* in this text obviates also a reading from **pgr* (Hebrew *pāgar* D-stem, “be exhausted;” Hebrew *peger*, Ugaritic *pgr*, Akkadian *pagru*, “corpse”), which would demand the reading *pu-ga₁₄-ri* (*ga₁₄* is an uncommon value in Emarite cuneiform, attested sixteen times). Texts from Mari indicate that a sacrificial festival called *pagrā’um* was a major ritual event in that city, where Dagan, who was called *bēl pagrê*, was offered the corpses of previously deceased animals [A. 1258+:9, 10. Cf. Dominique Charpin, “Les malheurs d’un scribe ou de l’inutilité de sumérien loin de Nippur” in *Nippur at the Centennial* (ed. Maria de Jong Ellis; CRAI 35; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1992): 9]. The Mari text A.2428:3-6 demonstrates that a *pagrā’u* was also practiced in Yamḥad (i.e. Aleppo).

¹⁰⁸ The form of the noun in this case would be based on standard Akkadian *bukru*, with the insertion of an anaptyctic vowel. Anaptyxis, when it occurs in Emar Akkadian, almost always occurs in the environment of the consonant *r*, which gives a good explanation for its presence here (Seminara, *L’accadico di Emar*, 153-54; GAG §12b). Fleming’s translation of Emar 373, however, contains some alternation between “Lord of the Offspring” (lines 12, 45, 78, 170, 171, 180, 187) and the more West Semitic-looking “Dagan Lord of the Firstborn (lines 41, 77).

¹⁰⁹ Lluís Feliu, *The God Dagan in Bronze Age Syria* (CHANE 19; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 239. See also, Lluís Feliu “The Lord of the Offspring” *AuOr* 17-18 (1999-2000), 197-200. The notion that Dagan’s *bu-ka-ru* titled contained a reference to Dagan’s fatherhood of the lesser deities was concurrently noted by Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 91.

¹¹⁰ Emar 373:190. Feliu, “The Lord of the Offspring,” 198.

¹¹¹ Emar 373: 98.

“Father of the great gods” (a-a dingir gal-gal-e-ne / *a-bi* DINGIR^[meš ra-bu-tim]) and “Begetter of the gods” (a-a ugu dingir-e-[ne] / *a-bu-um mu-[wa-lid* DINIGR^[meš]]),¹¹² as well as Aleppo, where an early second millennium inscription calls him “Father of the gods” (*a-bi* DINGIR^{hi.a}).¹¹³

Formally speaking, the rendering “Lord of the Offspring” is plausible. And certainly in some instances in Bronze Age Syria, Dagan was thought of as a kind of father-god. But it is less than clear that a “lord of the offspring” should be seen as semantically equivalent to “father of the gods.” The noun *bukru*, though it certainly can be used in standard Akkadian to describe divine figures when questions of their parentage arise, does not, in itself, imply a reference to divinity. The only other attestation of *bukru* (vocalized as such) with the meaning “offspring” in Emar documentation occurs in a canonical literary text presumably derived from Mesopotamia and refers to *human* offspring.¹¹⁴ Moreover, the expression of paternity through the noun *bēlu*, “lord, master,” would be quite an irregular use of the term. More properly, it implies ownership and, when given as a title to a deity, suggests his/her management of or responsibility for a named phenomenon, place, or thing.¹¹⁵ A statement of divine paternity would be awkwardly expressed in this idiom.

The actual events of the festival and the symbols that they employ furthermore fail to reflect upon themes such as Dagan’s paternal nature or the ascendancy of Dagan

¹¹² A. 1258+:9, 10. Charpin, “Les malheurs d’un scribe,” 9.

¹¹³ Daniel Fleming, “Baal and Dagan in Ancient Syria,” *ZA* 83 (1993), 88 n. 5. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 90, esp. n. 178. Feliu, “The Lord of the Offspring,” 198-99.

¹¹⁴ Emar 778:6. The composition known as *šimā milka*, a canonical literary text known also from Ugarit (*Ugaritica* 5 163) and Boghazkoy (KUB 4.3 + KBo 12.70). Though it is usually assumed to stem from a core-Mesopotamian original version, the text is presently only known only in peripheral Akkadian contexts.

¹¹⁵ Thorkild Jacobsen, “Mesopotamian Gods and Pantheons” in *Toward the Image of Tammuz and Other Essays on Mesopotamian History and Culture* (ed. William Moran; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), 18; repr. from *Encyclopedia Britannica* II (1963): 972-978.

over the other gods, which is rather taken for granted. Nothing indicates an enthronement ritual for Dagan. Nothing emphasizes his role as progenitor of gods. These claims stand in sharp contrast to Fleming's interpretation of the festival as celebrating Dagan's "highest calling as the head of the pantheon, the father of the gods."¹¹⁶ The centrality of this aspect in Fleming's reckoning is, of course, based largely on his understanding of the title *bēl bu-ka-ri*, but he also leans on another putative aspect of Dagan in the festival to confirm that picture, which he reads as Dagan *abumma* and understands to mean "Dagan, the very father."¹¹⁷ This god would appear on the first day of the seventh year event (15th of SAG.MU), after the main procession and offerings. For Fleming, the appearance of this deity is something of an apex for the festival. He sees the preceding events as dramatically leading up to the sole appearance of this god, who embodies what Fleming takes to be the core symbolism of the festival.

But such an understanding of the festival events or the supposed name "Dagan *abumma*," itself, cannot be sustained. Dagan *abumma* would occur only in Emar 373:190; such a name exists nowhere else in the Emar literature, ritual or otherwise, or in the *zukru* festival text, itself. That is to say, Dagan *abumma*, who, in Fleming's reckoning, appears as perhaps the most important symbol of the festival, receives not a

¹¹⁶ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 91.

¹¹⁷ Equivalent interpretations have been offered by every reader of the text. So Arnaud *Emar VI.3*, 364; Feliu, *The God Dagan*, 240. The nominative case of the second element, *abu-*, rules out a translation such as "DN of the father(s)," as is known elsewhere in the West Semitic world, e.g. KTU³ 1.74: 1; KTU³ 1.148:23; KTU³ 1.147:2 = KTU³ 1.118:1, 'il 'ib, Ilu-of-the-Father. If the putative Dagan *abumma* at Emar were taken as a comparison, the Ugaritic title could reasonably be reinterpreted as 'Ilu, the Father. But the syllabic equivalents reading DINGIR-*a-bi* in RSO XIV 22:1 (= RS 92.2004 // KTU³ 1.148:23) and *Ugaritica* 5 18:1 (= RS 20.024 // KTU³ 1.147:2 and KTU³ 1.118:1), which make clear the genitival relationship between the elements, make that understanding impossible. So Emar's Dagan *abumma* would have to stand alone in indicating Dagan's role as father. The addition of a non-coordinating, enclitic *-ma* would have to lend an emphatic force to the title, e.g. 'Dagan, the father indeed,' 'the utmost father,' or Fleming's "the very father."

single sacrificial offering and is nowhere mentioned in the hierarchical god-list, which appears to make reference to every deity of every shrine within the Emarite sphere of religious influence. Neither does he appear in Emar 378, the sacrificial list that is clearly associated with *zukru* practice. And, despite his ostensible centrality to the festival, the event is clearly described as being given to Dagan *bēl bukkari*, not Dagan *abumma*. If Dagan *abumma* were as central as Fleming would have him, it would be unthinkable to have him neglected so completely in terms of tangible acts of reverence through sacrificial provisioning.

Also not insignificant is the fact that, as a divine designation, the formula Dagan *abumma* is grammatically awkward. Divine titles in this text and as a general rule in Emar's ritual literature occur as (1) DN *bēl* (EN)/*bēlet* (GAŠAN) X, (2) DN *ša* X, or (3) DN X, where X is expressed in a genitival relationship to DN. A formula DN X, where X is in apposition to DN and states some feature of that DN, is not a known mode of entitlement.

Neither would the problem be sidestepped by assuming *abumma* was not a title or manifestation, but a simple description of Dagan. This text, like all of the ritual documents, is not prone to giving editorializing comments about the nature of a god or doxological descriptions of his/her character. The naming of the gods in these texts is functional, facilitating the proper ritual movements of the event. Theological commentary is not a feature of the ritual texts.

But the problem of Dagan *abumma* is, in fact, an illusion, because such a deity, as a manifestation of Dagan or as an alternate designation of his *bukkaru* aspect, surely never existed. The word previously read as "*abumma*" is to be understood as *apûma*, a

verbal adjective of the doubly weak Akkadian verb *apû*, known in West Semitic as *yp ‘, “to be visible.”¹¹⁸ The word is not intended to designate an entitled aspect of Dagan, at all, but rather to describe his physical state at this moment of the ritual event. This description has its place in the context of the veiling rites for Dagan and, indeed, alleviates what would otherwise be a problem with the progression of veiling rites. At the beginning of this day, Dagan *bēl bukkari* was brought out in procession veiled (*kuttumū*). Later, after the perambulation rite, the text instructs “they will veil his face” (*ukattamū*). Clearly, at some point between these two events Dagan must have been unveiled and it is precisely the moment in question where the text describes the unveiling. Failing to read *apûma* where it occurs leaves an impossible gap in the veiling instructions, which are so important as to be recounted not only in the action-focused second part of the text, but also in the offering-focused first part.

¹⁸⁶In the next year, in the month of SAG.MU, on the 14th day, they will distribute the restrained lambs ¹⁸⁷among the gods. The next day, the 15th, Šaggar(-day), Dagan Lord of the First Fruit, ¹⁸⁸and all the gods (and) *šaššabeyānātu* they will bring out to the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones. ¹⁸⁹The face of Dagan is veiled during his departure. They will give the sacrifices according to what is written on the tablet ¹⁹⁰to the gods. On that very same day, they will bring forth Dagan, visible, and also Šaggar. ¹⁹¹Also the bread of Šaggar of all the city of Emar will go up. Before evening ¹⁹²Dagan will pass between the *sikkānu*-stones. They will veil his face. ¹⁹³At the Central City Gate they will perform the rites of the Consecration Day. ¹⁹⁴The bread (and) meat in front of the gods will go up into the city.

The Dagan described in line 190 is Dagan *bēl bukkari*. Throughout the text, he is normally described with his full title only in his first mention in each section (i.e. for each day). Subsequent references to him refer to him in a shorthand way as simply “Dagan.”¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ The Akkadian verb *apû* is not well attested in the G-stem, preferring the D-stem. However, the West Semitic substrate may affect the conjugation here, since *yp ‘ in Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Aramaic is typically found in the G- or C-stems, rather than the D-stem. The enclitic *-ma* is an emphatic, rather than a coordinating, particle in this instance.

¹¹⁹ Cf. line 170 vs. 174 in the same section; 180 vs. 183 in the same section; 187 vs. 189 in the same section.

The prescription of line 190 does not involve bringing out new deities; “*all* the gods” have already been brought out in procession, as per line 187. Line 190 names two gods among those already processed out—Šaggar and Dagan (*bēl bukkari*)—who are now brought forward for another ritual purpose *after* the procession and the sacrificial offerings “as written on the tablet” (line 189). And at this ritual moment, Dagan’s previously veiled face is exposed.¹²⁰

Thus we are left with no compelling reason to see the ritual as especially celebrating Dagan’s divine parenthood or kingship or to read a statement of divine paternity in his festival title *bēl bukkari*. But there is yet an interpretive avenue that both makes sense of the title, philologically, and opens a window into the nature of the festival that works in concert with the other observable features of the ritual to create a unified ritual syntax. This avenue is opened through the recognition of the use of the root **bkr* that is unique to West Semitic, a dialect of which was the native language of Emar, for designating primogeniture—the state of being born or produced first.¹²¹ It should be considered a matter of course that it is this meaning that would be fundamental to the designation of an Emarite god. After all, “Dagan *bēl bukkari*” is a proper name with a

¹²⁰ In the three other occasions where the unveiled state of Dagan is described, it is done with forms of the verb *pētu* (cf. lines 164, 172, and 202). But the alternation of designations for ritual actions, states, or objects is not at all unusual in this text. Compare the alternation between *pašāšu* and *terû* for the anointing rite; between the nouns *sikkānu* and *haršu* to designate the standing stones, which factor prominently into the event; between UDU and SILA₄ to designate ovine offerings. The language used to describe the ritual elements is not internally consistent. Neither does the fact that *apû* is not used elsewhere in the Emar documents a useful consideration for choosing not to read it here. Neither the verb *terû* nor many other elements of ritual terminology occur outside of isolated, single ritual contexts.

¹²¹ The use of the term for designating primogeniture—in this case, a firstborn child—is attested at Emar in the personal name ^m*Bu-kur-ŠEŠ-šû* (“His Brother is the Firstborn”; *ASJ* 13:29.) Fleming seems to have recognized the possibility of this implication in *bukkaru*: twice in his edition of Emar 373+ he translates the title “Lord of the Firstborn” (lines 41 and 77; cf. the seven times he translates “Lord of the Offspring,” lines 12, 45, 78, 170, 171, 180, and 187). His discussion clearly depends on an understanding based on “Offspring,” so what he envisioned a “Lord of the Firstborn” to be is unclear. “Firstborn,” a term which implies social statuses associated with human birth order, seems not to be at stake in the interests of this ritual.

proper title for a West Semitic god. Even though the text is written in Akkadian, we wouldn't expect *proper* nouns to take on an Akkadianized meaning that is foreign to the use of the same term in Emar. Dagan *bēl bukkari* is a uniquely Emarite (indeed, uniquely *zukru*) god and should accordingly reflect ideas that would be epistemically appropriate for Emar's West Semitic population. The interpretation of *bukkaru* must find its center in the nexus of ideas about primogeniture.

But we need not rely entirely on etymology since there is an additional, as yet unrecognized clue about the identity of this aspect of Dagan given in this very text. When the activities of Dagan *bēl bu-ka-ri* in the *zukru* are mapped out, a connection with yet another divine title becomes clear. The epithet of Dagan, *bēl SIG₄*, occurs only once in the text (line 18), in the description of rites for the 25th of Niqalu in the year preceding the primary *zukru* events. Dagan *bēl SIG₄* is brought out in procession, his face veiled, in a parade of sacrificial animals that lead him to a kind of outdoor shrine. The title *bēl SIG₄* also appears in some sacrificial offering lists, the divine population of which show affinities with the longer *zukru* text.¹²²

The logogram SIG₄ represents the Akkadian word *libittu*, "brick." Hence translates Arnaud, "seigneur des briques," and Fleming, "The Lord of Brickwork"—the latter speculating that this Dagan was responsible for renovations to the city in preparation for the following year's festival event.¹²³

¹²² Emar 380:3; 381:6.

¹²³ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 67 n. 66. Cf. also Feliu, who suggests that this Dagan was concerned with the success of urbanism, pointing also to Dagan's title "Lord of Inhabited Regions" later in the text (*The God Dagan*, 242). There is no precedent for a "Lord of the Brick" elsewhere, though a brick god, Kulla, existed in southern Mesopotamia. It was only the molding of bricks that fell under Kulla's purview, however, as the task of laying bricks for building foundations was assigned to the builder-god, Mušdamma, according to the composition "Enki and the World Order" ETCSL 1.1.3, 335-357. There is no evidence for cultic worship of Kulla in any period. Cf. Wilfred Lambert, "The Sumero-Babylonian Brick-God Kulla" *JNES* 46/3 (1987): 203-204.

But when the two-part structure of the text is taken into account and the same days that are covered in parts I and II are read together, a revelation about the god occurs:

Dagan *bēl* SIG₄ is Dagan *bēl bukkari*.

<p>¹⁷[On the next day,] on the 25th [day], all the gods and the <i>šaššabênātu</i> ¹⁸[will go out...] <u>Dagan <i>bēl</i> SIG₄</u> will process out, his face veiled.</p>	<p>¹⁸⁰In the month of Niqualu [on the 25th day <u>Dagan <i>bēl</i> <i>bukkari</i></u> and all the gods ¹⁸¹they will bring out to the Gate of the <i>sikkānu</i>-Stones, [his fa]ce veiled for his departure ¹⁸²and his return.</p>
--	---

In Part II of the text, it becomes clear that the god who is brought out in procession to the outdoor shrine with his face veiled, previously called Dagan *bēl* SIG₄, is the same individual as Dagan *bēl bukkari*. These two names refer to the same title of the same god, but only in different writings. This equation is supported by the sacrificial lists, which contain *either* Dagan *bēl bukkari* or Dagan *bēl* SIG₄, but never both since they are, in fact, the same deity.¹²⁴

We should not infer from this, however, that SIG₄ actually stands for the word *bukkaru* in this text. In the first place, there is no evidence of SIG₄ ever designating anything other than the Akkadian word *libittu*. In the second place, were we to suppose the Emarite scribe innovated a non-standard logographic value for SIG₄, to my knowledge, there is no Semitic word with the root **bkr* that could conceivably correspond to the semantic range of that logogram. Thus we can only conclude that the same manifestation of the god is referenced by written forms whose terms correspond inexactly.

To understand the connection of an ostensible “Lord of Brick” with *bēl bukkari*, which relates to primogeniture, it must be clarified that the “brick” (SIG₄) need not refer

¹²⁴ Compare Emar 380 and 381 with Emar 378.

to an architectural block of clay.¹²⁵ In fact, in texts of local authorship, SIG₄ never actually refers to a brick in that sense.¹²⁶ When all the uses of SIG₄ in local texts are considered together, it becomes clear that SIG₄, in local parlance, is a bit of ritual terminology. Outside of its three occurrences in the divine title Dagan *bēl* SIG₄, the term is always used to describe a ritual offering: SIG₄ PÈŠ, which renders Akkadian *libitti titti*, “a ‘brick’ of fig(s).”

This use of Akkadian *libittu* is not novel. Although it is most frequently used to designate building material, the term can be used to refer to any unit of commodity in the shape of a rectangular prism—what might be described as a “slab.”¹²⁷ The “brick” in this divine title refers to a flat-sided, quadrilateral container for measuring, storing, and transporting fruit—at Emar, it seems, for the express purpose of ritually offering produce to the gods. The most precise translation of *bēl* SIG₄ would be “Lord of the Flat.” Flats are especially useful for packaging fragile produce in such a way that provides protection while also allowing compact storage.

If the “Lord of the Flat (of produce)” and the “Lord of *bukkaru*” are the same god, but *bukkaru* is not the name of the “flat,” itself, then it must be the case that *bukkaru* designates the contents of the Flat, a type of produce. That proposition can be confirmed etymologically. The root **bkr* is characterized by the idea of primogeniture in the most literal sense of the word: “that which is generated first”—a concept that is not limited to human “firstborns.” The **bkr* nouns fundamentally mean “early things, firstlings,” from

¹²⁵ E.g. Emar 545:268-69; 610:22, 42.

¹²⁶ SIG₄ can be found in the Emar texts referring to mudbricks, but these uses are confined to the canonical Mesopotamian lexical series and omen compendia.

¹²⁷ CAD L s.v. *libittu* mng. 3. For the currency of such use in Late Bronze Peripheral Akkadian, see EA 19:38.

which secondary attachments to particular types of firstlings arise. One of the best known uses of **bkr* in a nominal form is the designation of the ritual offering in Biblical Hebrew called *bikkûrîm*, “first fruits,” also reflected in Arabic *bākūrat*, “early fruit.” Closer to the Middle Euphrates, the same may be reflected in Eblaite *ba-ga-ru*₁₂(LU),¹²⁸ a lexical correspondent to Sumerian NE.SAG, which, difficult as that term is, may suggest a connotation of “first fruits.”¹²⁹ The Dagan of the *zukru* festival is the “Lord of First Fruits,” or the “Lord of the Flat (of First Fruits)” — a variant title in which the “flat” stands metonymically for the collected harvest of first fruits.¹³⁰

The most abundant source of data for the ritualizing with first fruits is the Hebrew Bible, where rituals of first produce stand in the broader context of primogenitary offerings that also includes the sacrifice of firstborn animals and

¹²⁸ MEE 4 243. See Manfred Krebernik, “Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der lexikalischen Texte aus Ebla. Teil 2 (Glossar),” *ZA* 73 (1983): 13.

¹²⁹ The first fruits connotation of NE.SAG was established by J. van Dijk, “Une insurrection generale au pays le Larša avant l’avenement de Nūr-Adad,” *JCS* 19 (1965): 18-24. For continuing discussion of the meaning of the term, see Wolfgang Heimpel, “The Nanshe Hymn,” *JCS* 33 (1981): 104-05; Gebhard Selz, “ne-saḡ, bur- saḡ und gū-ne(-saḡ-ḡa): Zu zwei Gefässbezeichnungen, ihren Bedeutungs-entwicklungen und einem sumerischen Wort für (Gefäß)schrank,” *SEL* 13 (1996), 3-8. In his short note, “ne-saḡ,” *N.A.B.U.* (1994): 72-73, Heimpel eschewed the reading of *bu-ga-ru*₁₂ for MEE 4 243, preferring to see *pa-ga-lu*, a libation vessel, as the Eblaite parallel to NE.SAG. However, that reading does not take into account line 270 with a similar orthography *bū-ga-ru*₁₂, parallel to DUMU.SAG with the clear implication of a **bkr* root. That consideration, of course, does not necessitate the same root for the NE.SAG entry, though it provides an orthographic precedent in a seemingly related semantic field.

¹³⁰ Considering the uniqueness of SIG₄ to the offering of PÈŠ “figs” elsewhere in Emarite ritual, it is also possible to understand *bukkaru* as designating a specific type of fruit: the early fig. Biblical Hebrew would also provide cognate evidence for that understanding with the word *bikkûrâ*, the “early fig (cf. Isa 28:4; Jer 24:2; Hos 9:10; Mi 7:1). The same meaning was, at some point, attached to Arabic *bākūrat*, as well, since that word was borrowed into Portuguese and Spanish (with the Arabic definite article) as a term designating an early ripening fig, *albacora*. There is much to commend an interpretation of Dagan’s festival title relating to figs. That fig harvests were a landmark calendrical event is demonstrated by the Old Assyrian month name, *te’inātum*, “(month of) figs.” Moreover, the remarkable process of fig horticulture, which was facilitated by the ancient discovery of caprification provides a powerful metaphor for humanity’s intervention in nature under divine aegis for the creation of a superior environment—a theme that might be reflected elsewhere in *zukru* ideology. However, I do not advocate for this understanding here since no other element in the festival suggests attention specifically to figs. The broader interpretation in the context of first fruits, from which the “early fig” terms, after all, derive, better aligns with the more general agricultural interests of the event.

humans.¹³¹ The Hebrew term *bikkûrîm* refers to the first yield issued by all manner of plants and trees.¹³² As a ritual good, they must be offered to the deity. Deuteronomy requires this donation continuously for every type of crop as its first harvest occurs.¹³³ In Priestly writings, first fruits are particularly associated with grain harvests, both barley and wheat, which must be offered in the sanctuary upon first harvest.¹³⁴ But the occasion of the wheat harvest, which provides the setting for the Feast of Weeks, has a special attachment to first fruits. It is the event that is called *yôm habbikkûrîm* in the Priestly source. The same occasion is celebrated as a pilgrimage festival in Deuteronomy, the *ḥag šābû 'ôti*, and in the Second Temple period becomes the *ḥag habbikkûrîm*.¹³⁵ In this way, *bikkûrîm* denotes not only a ritual good, but also gives a title for the fixed, annualized ritual offering of agricultural first-fruits before the god, the primary purpose of which was to effect the bestowal of divine blessing¹³⁶ and “to beseech the Deity for a bountiful harvest.”¹³⁷

¹³¹ Four legal expressions are given to the demand on human and animal firstlings, found in the Book of the Covenant (Exod 22:28-29), the Priestly codes (Lev 27:26-27; Num 18:15-17), Deuteronomy (15:19-23), and the laws of Exodus 13 (vv. 11-16).¹³¹ The Covenant Code states the requirement categorically: “You will give to me [Yahweh] your firstborn (*bēkôr*) sons. So also will you do concerning the ox and the herd. He will be with his mother seven days; on the eighth day you must give him to me” (Exod 22:28-29). Exod 13 preserves a less rigid requirement, acknowledging the special status of all firstlings but allowing human and donkey firstlings, apparently the two most valuable classes, to be redeemed. Other formulations of the law of the firstborn place an emphasis only on non-human animals, apparently excluding humans from the requirement entirely. In Priestly reckoning, firstborns are innately consecrated and so they belong to God from birth. Deuteronomy requires the consecration of firstborns, showing that it does *not* perceive them as innately consecrated, although they are still owed to Yahweh. In both cases, the requirement for firstborn sacrifice is self-evident: Yahweh is a god who requires first progeny.

¹³² Cf. Num. 18:13, *bikkûrê kol 'ăšer b'e'aršām*; Neh. 10:36, *bikkûrê 'admātēnû ûbikkûrê kol p'e'rî kol 'ēš*; grapes in Num. 13:20, *bikkûrê 'ānābîm*; wheat in Exod 34:22, *bikkûrê q'e'sîr ḥittîm*

¹³³ “You will take some of the first fruit of the ground which you harvest from the land...and you shall put it in a basket and go to the place which the Lord your god will choose...” (Deut 26:2).

¹³⁴ This understanding stems from the festival calendar in the Holiness Code, Lev 23. For the identification of the crop in each case, which is unspecified in Lev 23, see Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1982.

¹³⁵ Cf. 11QT 19:9.

¹³⁶ Cf. Ezek 40:30 to illustrate this goal.

¹³⁷ Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1992. Abstinence from consuming portions of produce at prescribed times is described explicitly as a method of increasing agricultural yield in Lev 19:23-25. Here, the Israelites

The *zukru* festival, itself, does not seem to have been a first fruits ritual. There is no evidence that offerings of first fruits were presented to the deities in the course of the event and no special attention to any one crop that might have been harvested at the time. Moreover, the timing of the event in the first of the year, which would correspond with the time of the autumn planting, does not suggest a harvest setting.¹³⁸ Rather than waiting until harvest time, this ritual quite astutely seeks the blessing of the god of first fruits at the time of planting, when the crops will become established for success at harvest. It seeks this favor not through the offering of first fruits, but through ritual appeasement of the god at the outset of the growing season. Neither are these the only reasons to understand the *zukru* as specially related to the agricultural cycle. Certain designated actors in the *zukru* material, such as the *zirāti*-men, whose name connects them to the activity of sowing, and the cultivators of the land, underscore this connection not just through their agricultural connections but through specific emphasis on the preparatory stages of farming. The shorter *zukru* text may even contain the ritual requirement to abstain from plowing during the sacred events, which would demonstrate that the act of agricultural preparation was not incidental to the backdrop of the festival, but rather an integral concern of its execution.

Even as the *zukru* festival itself was probably not an occasion upon which first fruits offerings would have been made, this aspect of Dagan apparently relates to a broader network of ritual ideas at Emar. In fact, it is very likely that first fruits offerings

abstain from eating the harvest three years, consecrate the crop of the fourth year for Yahweh, and finally eat the produce of the fifth year, when the yield will be greater by the god's intervention.

¹³⁸ For the likelihood that the Emarite year began with the autumnal equinox, see Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 132; 211-13. The same was true in Upper Mesopotamia at least in the Old Assyrian period; cf. Dominique Charpin, "Les archives d'époque 'assyrienne' dans le palais de Mari," *M.A.R.I.* 4 (1985): 246.

of the more traditional sort did occur in other Emarite ritual events. In Emar 446, the archaic six-month ritual calendar, and event called *bu-GA-ra-tu₄* is prescribed, which should now be read *bu-kà-ra-tu₄*. The text relates no details about the ritual, only stating this word—the name of the event—and providing a date for its observance.¹³⁹ Another textual fragment, which records the donation of ritual goods to a deity whose name is not preserved, appears to call for an offering of *bu-uk-ku-ra-tu₄*.¹⁴⁰ The precise meaning of these ritual terms, *bu-kà-ra-tu₄* and *bu-uk-ku-ra-tu₄*, is unclear and the contexts of their appearances are vague.¹⁴¹ Yet we can recognize that they exist in a nexus with the epithet of Dagan *bēl bukkari* and, by virtue of this recognition, we may see that *bukkaru* is a ritual concept deeply woven into Emarite ritual practice. In addition to giving Dagan his festival title, this idea bequeaths the proper name of a ritual event (*bu-kà-ra-tu₄*) and characterizes a type of ritual offering (*bu-uk-ku-ra-tu₄*). The impact is to see that primogeniture was an important ritual concept in Emar and that Dagan had a unique connection with the ritualization of the first fruits of agriculture.

¹³⁹ Emar 446:85. The event is dated for the 15th of Marzahānu, month V of the calendar. As a winter month, agricultural first fruits would be unexpected here, unless the people of Emar kept such offerings in storage for the appropriate times, as the Talmud describes for ancient Israel. Some other type of primogenitary offering or rite might, rather, be at stake. Arnaud understands *bu-GA-ra-tu₄* as another term for “bovins.” Fleming leaves the word untranslated (*Time at Emar*, 275), a strategy followed more recently by Bryan Babcock, *Sacred Ritual: A Study of the West Semitic Ritual Calendars in Leviticus 23 and the Akkadian Text Emar 446* (BBR Supp. 9; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 165 and n. 111 (which mistakes Fleming’s discussion of the term’s orthography for arguments about its meaning).

¹⁴⁰ Emar 406:5. The offering is given by a group called *munabbiātu*, evidently a class of female divine invocation specialists. See further, Jonathan Stökl, “The מַנְבִּיאוֹת in Ezekiel 13 Reconsidered” *JBL* 132 (2013): 61–76.

¹⁴¹ It is certainly possible that both should be translated simply as “first fruits,” only in femininized forms for the designation of the event and offering, themselves. Quite likely, *bu-uk-ku-ra-tu₄* is even morphologically related to the Biblical Hebrew term *bikkûrîm*. The *qattûl* nominal pattern of *bu-uk-ku-ra-tu₄*, which makes explicit the geminated middle radicle that should be read in all of the **bkr* words in question, first of all, shows that the word is West Semitic, since there is no *qattûl* in standard Akkadian. *bukkûr-* at Emar likely reflects the common West Semitic form of the same word that evolves into *bikkûr-* in Iron Age Hebrew through the expected phonological change known as back-vowel dissimilation. Cf. Joshua Fox, *Semitic Noun Patterns* (HSS 59; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 275–76. GKC §84^b.

Recognizing this very valence of Dagan helps to bring into focus the way in which the festival's system of divinity has been designed to facilitate its specific objectives. It might otherwise be taken as a matter of course that ^dNIN.URTA, the second god to be mentioned in the special offerings for the sixth year preparatory rites and the first day of the seventh-year festival¹⁴² and the only god besides Dagan to have a demonstrably active role in festival rites, is treated with a place a respect.¹⁴³ He is, after all, a kind of patron or city god for Emar. He figures most prominently into the mass of Conventional Format land-sale documents at Emar, where any land purchased from the city holdings were said to be purchased from ^dNIN.URTA in collaboration with the council of city elders. A seal that is referred to in the documents as the seal of ^dNIN.URTA,¹⁴⁴ despite the fact that ^dNIN.URTA's name does not appear on it, as such, ratified these contracts, standing for city authority even where individual councilmen's sealings do not appear.¹⁴⁵ When claims were brought against a property, fines were remitted to ^dNIN.URTA and the City (URU.KI) and when a property was repossessed, it was ^dNIN.URTA who confiscated it.¹⁴⁶ As Joan Westenholz has summarized it,

¹⁴² Emar 373: 23-24; 52-53. Lines 52-53 record the offering but mistakenly omit explicit reference to any DN. Based on comparison to the 25th of Niqalu in year 6, which attests similar offerings and order of recipients, ^dNIN.URTA is undoubtedly the recipient here.

¹⁴³ Additionally, ^dNIN.URTA stands seventh in the order of distribution of sheep on the 24th of Niqalu in the sixth year (373+:13). He seems in one instance to be subject to the veiling rite, along with Dagan (373+:176). And he is approached by Dagan after the perambulation of the *sikkānu*-stones and joined with Dagan in his wagon for the divine unification rite, after which he seems to have led a re-entry procession into the city with Dagan (373+:164, 175, 184, 203).

¹⁴⁴ E.g. Emar 194:14.

¹⁴⁵ In at least one case (Fs Kutscher 6), ^dNIN.URTA's seal is impressed upon the tablet even where ^dNIN.URTA was not mentioned as an authority. Only "The city of Emar," i.e. the council of elders, was mentioned, and the ^dNIN.URTA seal conveys their authority. Cf. Masamichi Yamada, "The Dynastic Seal and Ninurta's Seal: Preliminary Remarks on Sealing by the Local Authorities of Emar," *Iraq* 56 (1994), 61.

¹⁴⁶ The coupling of "the City" with ^dNIN.URTA here, as opposed to "the Elders of the City" in the statement of purchase might indicate that "the City" and "the Elders of the City" refer to the same governing body.

“^dNIN.URTA seems to represent the deified city, as did Aššur in Assur... Thus

^dNIN.URTA is Emar and Emar is ^dNIN.URTA.”¹⁴⁷

But ^dNIN.URTA’s role in the *zukru* festival is not merely honorary. Insofar as the festival is given to the manifestation of Dagan whose concern is the first fruits of agriculture, it cannot be overlooked that ^dNIN.URTA is the perceived owner of the agricultural lands. The highly standardized format of land-sale transaction records, after defining the boundaries of any particular property, explicitly asserts ^dNIN.URTA’s claim to the property (A.ŠÀ ša ^dNIN.URTA) and reiterates his standing as owner (*bēlu*) alongside the elders who represent the city authority. That ^dNIN.URTA, even if appearing in the legal documents as a divine proxy for the city authority, itself, was perceived as the ultimate owner of the very lands that would be cultivated in the growing season truly necessitated his veneration in the festival that beseeched the gods for agricultural prosperity.

But his status as landowner is not the limit of his relevance to the festival, which is multifaceted, indeed. Although the identity of the Syrian deity lurking behind the designation as ^dNIN.URTA remains uncertain, the very use of that name ought to reveal something about the character of the deity *vis-à-vis* the Sumerian god Ninurta.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ Westenholz, “Emar—The City and its God,” 154-55.

¹⁴⁸ This discussion does not attempt to identify the name of the god represented in the texts as ^dNIN.URTA, since the identification of the god matters much less than the evaluation of what the god does in the ritual and how he was perceived by the ritual participants, which can be adduced from the texts without knowledge of the god’s Syrian name. Work has been done to identify the god, though a consensus is still elusive. Arnaud favors the god Aštar, based on the known equation of that god with Hurrian Aštabi at Ugarit and the equation of Aštabi with ^dNIN.URTA, in turn (*Ugaritica* 5 137 IVa 16; “Religion assyro-babylonienne,” *AEP* 96 (1987), 175. Fleming’s early work noted the possibility that ^dNIN.KALAM (*Bēl Māti*) was another name for ^dNIN.URTA, owing to the ascription of the divine consort Išḫara to both those deities. *Bēl Māti*, “Lord of the Land,” would be a good name for the city’s principal deity, such as is attested at Ebla and Mari (*Installation*, 250). Expanding on that suggestion, Fleming later proposed that ^dNIN.URTA could conceal a local manifestation of Dagan, himself [“Baal and Dagan in Ancient Syria” *ZA* 83 (1993):97-98]. Based on an Emar text from the Bible Lands Museum in Jerusalem that records an inventory for a deity called only DINGIR *i-ma-ri* (“god of Imar; CM 13 27:9) and the occurrence of

Already, it has been noted that ^dNIN.URTA's role in the legal affairs of Emar corresponds with Ninurta's deep involvement in the law and economy of Nippur in the early second millennium.¹⁴⁹ Ninurta was the patron god of Nippur, which was also the seat of power for his father Enlil—a filial connection certainly not lost in ^dNIN.URTA's relationship to Dagan in Emar.¹⁵⁰ But, more to the point, Sumerian Ninurta was a god of agriculture. In the Sumerian composition known as *The Farmer's Instructions* Ninurta is called “the faithful farmer of Enlil” and the very writing of the manual is attributed to him.¹⁵¹ He can also be found with divine titles such as “The Tiller” (uru₄) and “Father of Vegetation” (^dAb.ba₆).¹⁵² He (as Ningirsu) is said to have invented the tools of agriculture in the Sumerian composition *The Rulers of Lagaš*¹⁵³ and in the early second millennium text *The Fields of Nippur*, he is shown to be in charge of all the fields associated with that city.¹⁵⁴ Of special interest for the present case of the *zukru*, the inhabitants of Nippur celebrated an *akītu*-festival dedicated to Ninurta, which seems to have been in honor of the seasonal flood he would bring to irrigate the agricultural lands, and to ritualize the

similar titles in the *zukru* materials (^dEN *i*-[*ma*-ar], ^dEN EN *i*-[*ma*]r, ^dIŠKUR EN *i*-*ma*-ar), Joan Westenholz suggested that a god with the attributes of a weather deity must have been the principal god of Emar, perhaps simply called Il Imari. She further equated DINGIR *i*-*ma*-ri with a certain DINGIR *ha*-*ma*-ri (CM 13 19:1), arguing that the latter exposes the original first root consonant of Emar's name (rendering the name of the city “donkey-town”). Since DINGIR *ha*-*ma*-ri tops a sacrificial offering list in which Išhara, the otherwise-known consort of ^dNIN.URTA, stands second, this “God of Emar” could be ^dNIN.URTA, himself (“Emar—The City and its God,” 151-59).

¹⁴⁹ Fleming, *Installation*, 248. Westenholz, “Emar—The City and its God,” 160.

¹⁵⁰ A seal sometimes called the “seal of ^dNIN.URTA” (which does not actually identify itself with the name ^dNIN.URTA) was an authoritative legal marker in wide use in the Emar documents. The object bears an inscription that includes the phrase “Son of Dagan.” Cf. Yamada, “The Dynastic Seal and Ninurta's Seal,” 61.

¹⁵¹ ETCSL 5.6.3 Cf. Miguel Civil, *The Farmer's Instructions: A Sumerian Agricultural Manual* (AuOrS 5; Barcelona: Editorial Ausa, 1994), 1. Franz Wiggermann, “Agriculture as Civilization: Sages, Farmers, and Barbarians” in *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture* (ed. Karen Radner and Eleanor Robson; Oxford: University Press, 2011), 668.

¹⁵² Amar Annus, *The God Ninurta in the Mythology and Royal Ideology of Ancient Mesopotamia* (SAAS 14; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2002), 152. Civil, *The Farmer's Instructions*, 98.

¹⁵³ ETCSL 2.1.2 1-16. Cf. Annus, *The God Ninurta*, 128.

¹⁵⁴ Annus, *The God Ninurta*, 128. Civil, *The Farmer's Instructions*, 98.

initiation of a new agriculture cycle at the time of plowing and sowing.¹⁵⁵ Indeed, in mythology, Ninurta, himself, can be represented as a flood, potentially with destructive results.¹⁵⁶ But, insofar as the god chooses to hold back destructive flooding, he is, indeed, “depicted as the saviour of the land from the threatening deluge and as the inventor of agriculture.”¹⁵⁷

It is impossible to know to what degree southern Mesopotamian traditions and mythologies about the god would have corresponded to the Syrian deity represented by the identifier “^dNIN.URTA.” And, to be sure, Ninurta is a god of many traits, including, for instance, his epic status as a hero god. But, especially as other traditional features of Ninurta can be noted in Emar’s portrayal of its god ^dNIN.URTA, such as his divine filiation and role as legal authority, it is likely that at least some of his associations with the agricultural pursuits would obtain in Emar, as well. His prominent role in the *zuku* festival, with its coordination to preparations for the planting season not at all unlike Ninurta’s *akītu* at Nippur, confirms that at least this aspect of ^dNIN.URTA existed in Emarite tradition.

While the aspects of ^dNIN.URTA as owner of Emarite lands and patron of agriculture evidence a continuity within the festival’s system of divinity that corresponds with the ostensible objectives of the ritual, his role as city god of Emar is not to be suspended from our assessment of his impact in the event. Whatever his other associations, ^dNIN.URTA was experienced in the mundane context of daily life by parties who utilized city legal services as the divine representative of the city of Emar—its lands,

¹⁵⁵ Annus, *The God Ninurta*, 61-62. Wiggerman, *Agriculture as Civilization*,” 680.

¹⁵⁶ *Lugale* 124; Cf. Annus, *Ninurta* 126.

¹⁵⁷ Annus, *The God Ninurta*, 127.

its urban structures, its human authorities. As Emar's city god, ^dNIN.URTA represented the interests of Emar, specifically, in the festival dedicated to the supra-regional—indeed, from the Middle Euphrates religious perspective, universal—god, Dagan. It is no surprise, in this respect, that ^dNIN.URTA is the only other god to play an active and prominent role in the ritual proceedings. This special relationship of ^dNIN.URTA to Dagan would be perceived by the festival participants as a privilege of Emar granted by grace of the highest authority. This act of favor is most powerfully symbolized in the rite of unification of Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA, which is considered in depth, below.

Completing what is sure to be the most important divine triad in the festival is the enigmatic goddess Šaššabêttu. This deity, along with her eponymous group of divinities called *šaššabeyānātu*, is unknown outside of Emar. Even in the Emar texts, her appearance is limited to a few variations of the *kissu* festival documents and a single cultic dedicatory inscription (to ^dNIN.URTA).¹⁵⁸ The paucity of her visibility in the Emar literature makes her prominence in the *zuku* festival (and the *zuku* sacrificial list, Emar 378) all the more surprising. Not only is she honored with sacrificial offerings alongside the two most important gods of Emar, who are, not incidentally, also the two primary gods of the ritual (cf. Emar 375+), but her portions outstrip even those of ^dNIN.URTA.¹⁵⁹ Along with the moon-god Šaggar, she makes a special ritual appearance of indeterminate significance on the 15th of SAG.MU (the day of the full moon) in the sixth year.

Otherwise, we find her namesake deities, *šaššabeyānātu*, specified for procession *in*

¹⁵⁸ Her name is also visible on one ritual fragment, Emar 396:4, which very likely belongs to one of the *kissu* texts. Arnaud's restoration of a broken line in the fragment Emar 458:10 postulates her name, written with the unique orthography [^dŠa]-ša-be-et-tu [...].

¹⁵⁹ On the 25th of Niqalu in the sixth year, she receives a calf and seven sheep, as compared with ^dNIN.URTA's three sheep (and no calf; cf. 23-28). A similar offering recurs on the 15th of SAG.MU in the seventh year, though the exact numbers of the offerings are obscured for both deities by textual lacunae (cf. lines 52-56).

addition to “all the gods” on the 15th and 21st of SAG.MU during the seventh-year festival.

Despite her importance in the festival, Šaššabêttu is absent from certain contexts in which we expect her. She appears nowhere in the hierarchical god-list, which is enumerated for the provisioning of sacrifices during the seven-day event.

Correspondingly, she is not included in the offerings for the 24th of Niqalu in the sixth year, which are apportioned to the top thirteen members of the first tier deities of the list. Dagan *bēl bukkari* and ^dNIN.URTA, on the other hand, appear in both. Šaššabêttu’s absences are a bit less puzzling if we recognize, on the broader scale, that the goddess has a special association with ^dNIN.URTA. Three times in this text she is identified as “Šaššabêttu of ^dNIN.URTA’s temple.” That identification has the dual effect of suggesting that other of the *šaššabeyānātu* are associated with different temples and, more importantly, that the one of concern in the *zukru* festival is only the singular goddess who belongs to the temple of Emar’s city god.

Her relationship to ^dNIN.URTA is externally confirmable. Nowhere is it clearer than in the dedicatory inscription to ^dNIN.URTA written by Ba‘lu-malik—most likely the Diviner of that name. After dedicating cultic accoutrements to ^dNIN.URTA, Ba‘lu-malik did not forget to add gifts of red wool clothing for three additional deities: We’da, Adammatera, and Šaššabêttu, no doubt because they reside with ^dNIN.URTA in his temple.¹⁶⁰ And this is not the only mention of a divine entourage dwelling with that god. The *zukru* sacrificial list, Emar 378, enumerates “^dNIN.URTA and the deities of the

¹⁶⁰ CM 13 24:14-16.

temple; Šaššabêttu.”¹⁶¹ Here, the offering is directed to ^dNIN.URTA *along with* those deities associated with him, which is characteristic for this text. But, given the *zuku* context of the list, where Šaššabêttu figures prominently, she is specified by name, even though she would naturally have been included among “the deities of the (^dNIN.URTA’s) temple.”

It is particularly Emar 378 that elucidates Šaššabêttu’s absence from the standardized offering lists in Emar 373+. Those lists (lines 12-15, 77-95) enumerate the top-tier deities, noting only a single name for each entry. Emar 378 retains the same hierarchy reflected in those two lists, but embellishes the entry of each named god with the names of his/her associates.¹⁶² Sometimes these are consorts, such as “^dNIN.LÍL of Dagan *bēl bukkari*” and “^dIŠKUR and Hebat.”¹⁶³ However, other types of associates can

¹⁶¹ Emar 378:7-8. Arnaud’s transcription of the line reads, “^dNin-urta ù dingir.meš Sa_x-bit-ti,” translated, “Ninurta et les Sept.” This understanding cued Volkert Haas to identify this line as designating the heptad of Ninurta. Once identified, he decided that the *šaššabeyānātu* must also be a designation for the heptad, basing his claim on a partial etymology that identifies the root *šb* ‘ nestled within the word. This understanding would bring Emar into line with the broader pattern of heptads frequently associated with weather deities that Haas seeks to identify in otherwise unrecognized Near Eastern and Anatolian religious systems (Haas, *Geschichte der Hethitischen Religion*, 481-87, 572-73). This problematic understanding of Emar’s *šaššabeyānātu* is avoided by reanalyzing 378:7, recognizing that Arnaud’s *sa_x* = *ša* and *bit* should be read É. Such are the readings of Fleming (*Time at Emar*, 118) and Manfred Dietrich [“Die Parhedra im Pantheon von Emar” *UF* 29 (1997): 117], though their understandings of the lines differ. Dietrich sees the two phrases as unconnected. Line 7 reads “Ninurta und die Götter des Tempels” and line 8 represents a separate entry in the list containing the term *Šaššabêtti*. Fleming, however, reads the lines as a single statement referring to “Ninurta and the gods of the shrine of *Šaššabêtti*,” noting that this shrine would have been located within the temple of Ninurta (n.131).

¹⁶² The only difference in the ranked hierarchy is the ascension of ^dKUR GAL to second place, relegating ^dNIN.URTA to third. The combination of the moon and sun gods onto the same line, despite its absence in the sixth year *zuku* list, is reflected also in the *zuku* hierarchical list.

¹⁶³ Emar 378:2, 4. Arnaud believes the term *šaššabêttu* was a way to refer to a female divine consort without naming her—an idea that Dietrich expanded at length. But the examples of consorts in this list that are *not* designated in that way is enough to cast a shadow on such a theory. Dietrich’s strongest evidence in favor of the use of *šaššabêttu* as an alternate designation of a consort goddess comes from two copies of a *kissu* festival text, Emar 385. In 385A:21, the goddess ^dNIN.KUR is named for ritual action. But in the parallel line of another copy, 385F:21, the name Šaššabêttu is visible, with most of the line broken. Dietrich assumes incorrectly that Šaššabêttu has replaced ^dNIN.KUR in this case, and, ergo, that the terms are functionally interchangeable. But analysis of the entire section reveals that the initial lacuna is a break of approximately twelve signs, which means that the F text must have had a longer first line than the A text. It is more than likely that Šaššabêttu was added to the line *in addition to* ^dNIN.KUR, not in place of her. That understanding is made especially likely considering another *kissu* text, Emar 388F:64-65, which adds

be listed together, as well, such as “Alal and Amaza” and “^dNIN.KUR, Šaggar, and Ḫalma.”¹⁶⁴ It seems to be the case that the sacrificial offering is directed to the temple of the first named deity, which is noted in Emar 378 (and only that text) also to be for the benefit of whatever other deities reside in the temple of that god. Therefore, Šaššabêttu is not listed as a separate entry in this sacrificial list, but rather enumerated as part of the temple entourage of ^dNIN.URTA.¹⁶⁵ Accordingly, when the truncated 373+ lists make no mention of Šaššabêttu, it should be understood that she will enjoy the offering along with ^dNIN.URTA in his temple.¹⁶⁶

^dNIN.URTA seems to be invoked in the festival jointly as the god of agriculture and the owner of agricultural lands and Šaššabêttu is clearly his close associate. This connection goes some distance toward contextualizing her participation in the festival, even if specificity regarding her identity and role is lacking. Because of the agricultural themes of the festival, it seems most likely that, of the associates of ^dNIN.URTA, Šaššabêttu is one who is particularly associated with agricultural endeavors or, perhaps, fertility at large. It would be not at all surprising to find a deity who is a part of a divine

Šaššabêttu and ^dNIN.KUR as a pair in place of “the gods of Šatappi” in the K text. Moreover, understanding the term to mean only “consort” fails in cases where *šaššabêttu* is mentioned without reference to any other deity. Emar 385F:21, for example, begins a new section (marked off by a ruling), which reads (with restoration from 385A for heuristic purposes), “On the fourth day they will lift up the ‘consort’.” Whose consort? This passage should rather serve as evidence that Šaššabêttu is thought of independently. Dietrich leans on the fact that ^dNIN.KUR is designated in a parallel version of the text, but does not consider that the reader of 385F would not have had 385A at hand for cross-reference as he/she read.

¹⁶⁴ Emar 378:9, 12.

¹⁶⁵ That a deity who is not the primary entry in the list can be written on a separate line is shown by ^dNIN.LÍL ^dKUR EN *bu-ka-[ri]* in line 2.

¹⁶⁶ It is unclear whether Šaššabêttu’s appearances in the *kissu* festivals refer to the same goddess who is connected to the temple of ^dNIN.URTA. Since there is clearly a plurality of Šaššabêttu-type deities at Emar, it is not inconceivable that these festivals would utilize a different one of the goddesses, though it should be noted that in every non-*kissu* case where she is mentioned in the singular, the likely referent is the one of ^dNIN.URTA’s temple. One of the *kissu* texts, Emar 388F:64 specifies “Šaššabêttu from the temple of ^d[DN],” which falls just shy of identifying her residence. However, even this underscores the fact that Šaššabêttu is an inhabitant of other gods’ temples, not a temple-dweller in her own right.

group of females (*šaššabeyānātu*) being related to fertility concerns. Such is the known role of the Syrian goddesses of conception and birth called *kōtarātu* (*kašarātu* in Akkadian transcription).¹⁶⁷ The *kōtarātu* were a known category at Emar and, while they are not named in the extant text of the *zukru* festival, they are, in fact, listed twice in the *zukru* sacrificial list, Emar 378.¹⁶⁸ The particular job assigned to the *kōtarātu* appears to have been concerned with human fertility. Is it possible that a similar group at Emar existed for agro-pastoral fecundity?

What is especially interesting about the *kōtarātu*, as known from Ugarit, is their lunar genealogy. They are called “daughters of Hilālu”—the crescent moon.”¹⁶⁹ The connection of divine beings of fertility to a phase of the moon is, itself, unremarkable—the link between the moon and fertility is a near-universal feature of pre-modern societies and is well-attested in the ancient Syro-Mesopotamian environment. What is notable for the context of Emar’s *zukru* is that its dating is centered around the appearance of the full moon and its events last the duration of that moon phase. Indeed, the moon-god, Šaggar, is specially paraded in the event and, on the occasion of the first day of the full moon (15th of SAG.MU in the sixth year), is accompanied for a ritual procession by Šaššabêttu. Whether any more permanent link between these two deities is envisioned is indeterminate, but at least for this ritual occasion Šaššabêttu is seen in a special relationship with the moon. Even though the *šaššabeyānātu* have no obvious role in

¹⁶⁷ For the *kōtarātu*, see especially the Aqhat poem from Ugarit, KTU³ 1.17 II 26-42. For the naming of the individual members of the group, see KTU³ 1.24:40-48.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. line 18, “*kašarātu* of *išihī*” and line 35, “the Balih-gods and the *kašarātu*.”

¹⁶⁹ E.g., KTU³ 1.24:41-42, *bnt hll*; 1.17 II 26-27 and passim. Whether being daughters of the moon is the primary meaning of the epithet *bnt hll* has been a matter of debate. But even if not its primary designation, that such a genealogy can be applied to the *kōtarātu* is shown clearly by KTU³ 1.24:42, which further describes *hll* as *b'l gml*, “the Lord of the Sickles.” For full discussion of the epithets of this group, see Aicha Rahmouni, “The Epithets of the Kōtarātu Goddesses at Ugarit,” *AuOr* 30 (2012): 55-73.

human conception and birth like the *kōtarātu*, if my suspicion that their application to agro-pastoral fertility is correct, then an association with the moon would be appropriate. On the one hand, moon deities govern the rise of waters and so play an important role in irrigating crops.¹⁷⁰ On the other, the phases of the moon portray an analogy of the growth cycle, with the full moon representing the desired state of harvest abundance.

If there is merit in the comparison to the known Syrian group of goddesses related to fertility and birth then it should, finally, be noted that a counterpart existed in Mesopotamia by the name of *šassūrātu*, also used as a singular epithet for a mother-goddess, Šassūru.¹⁷¹ The group appeared in Syria by this name in Qatna, where a cultic inventory counts a necklace with “four lapis lazuli *šassūrātu*, (each one) holding her child on her lap.”¹⁷² Thus, the Mesopotamian terminology for such beings was current in LB Syria and representations of the goddesses could be found in a temple. Although no satisfactory etymological explanation for the term *šaššabeyānātu* is forthcoming,¹⁷³ I would note the phonetic similarity of *šassūru* along with its frequent counterpart *bāniat*, “creatress.” Such are the epithets of the Mesopotamian goddess Mami in the Atrahasis

¹⁷⁰ Cf. ETCSL 2.5.4.13, an *adab* to Nanna, which attributes the fertilizing waters of the Tigris and Euphrates to the moon-god, as well as the ability to make “lush vegetation in the spacious land.”

¹⁷¹ The equation of *šassūrātu* with *kōtarātu* is made explicit in *Ugaritica* 5 18:12.

¹⁷² Jean Bottéro, “Les inventaires de Qatna (Suite),” *RA* 43 (1949): 160 iv 223.

¹⁷³ The possible etymologies offered by Dietrich, both of which understand the initial *ša-* to be Akkadian relative pronoun, are unconvincing, starting with the unlikelihood that such a thoroughly West Semitic phenomenon, as Dietrich sees the *šaššabeyānātu*, would be named in Akkadian. He also fails to account for the presence of the *-n-* consonant (assimilated to the following *-t-*) in the singular version of the name, the presence of which is made clear in three orthographic instances (Emar 378:8; 458:10; CM 13 24:18). Fleming’s suggestion to relate to term to an unattested Š-stem form of *wašābu* may be on the right track, considering the clearly intentional wordplay of the verb *i-ša-ša-bu* with its object, Šaššabēttu, in Emar 388F:65. It is also not impossible that the form is appropriated from Hurrian, though demonstrable Hurrian impact on Emarite religion is minimal. In a Hurrian ritual text (KUB 27 1 III 48 // KUB 27 6 I 17) that describes attributes of Ištar/Šawuška, the unique term *šašš=ubad=i* appears. See Ilsa Wegner, *Gestalt und Kult der Ištar-Šawuška in Kleinasien* (AOAT 36; Hurritological Studien 3; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1981), 112. Despite its meaning being unclear, the context implies it may be a weapon associated with the goddess, perhaps as a hypostatization of her. Were this the root of Emar’s Šaššabēttu, the form, especially in the plural, would have been subject to local re-analyzing.

epic: *šassūru bāniat awīlūti* “the womb, creatress of humankind” and *šassūru banât šīmtu* “the womb, creatress of destiny.”¹⁷⁴

Any explanation of Šaššabêttu and her group of *šaššabeyānātu* through the comparison of *kōtarātu* or Mesopotamian *šassūru bāniatu* is only intriguing speculation in a void of confirming data. What is well-grounded, however, is that Šaššabêttu has a permanent connection to ^dNIN.URTA, who, in the *zukru* context, is specifically concerned with agricultural prosperity and that she is envisioned with a special relationship to the moon(-god), Šaggar, during the preparations for the festival. These facts, in themselves, suggest a role related to the fertility of the growing season.¹⁷⁵

It has become clear by now that the *zukru* is a festival is timed in coordination with the appearance of the full moon and that the lunar dimension is represented in festival divinity by the god Šaggar. This god is the only other deity to play any active role in the ritual performance (in addition to participating in divine processions). His two active appearances occur on the 15th of the month of SAG.MU in the sixth and seventh years of the cycle. The timing of his involvement is appropriate, as this day marks the first appearance of the first full moon of the year—a day three times in the text given the

¹⁷⁴ Wilfred Lambert and Alan Millard, *Atra-ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), 56 I 194 and 102 iii vi 47

¹⁷⁵ In his interpretation of this category of divinity, Fleming leaned primarily on the fact that they were a group of female beings who seemed to have been differentiated from “the gods” since they are mentioned separately. This led him to raise the comparison of the Mesopotamian *lamassātu*, protective spirits associated with individuals, institutions, or locations known to be represented as humanoid figurines (*Time at Emar*, 79). I remain skeptical of the suggestion since there is no demonstrable link between this group of divine beings and the nature of the *zukru* to justify the exalted role of what would be their patroness, Šaššabêttu, in the festival. Providing protection for the deities in procession is not enough—deities went on procession on many other occasions without them. Additionally, *lamassū* was a category known and used at Emar—the personal names, ^dLAMMA-ra-pi-i’ (RE 60:4) and the syllabically spelled *La-ma-sa-ni* (Emar 101:2) attest to it. So, unless they had some specialized role in distinction from the *lamassātu*, it is hard to envision why separate terminology would exist for them here.

befitting title “Day of Šaggar.”¹⁷⁶ Twice outside of Emar 373+ Šaggar is connected to the 15th day of the first month: in the shorter *zukru* (Emar 375C:3) and in the six-month ritual calendar (Emar 446:45), the first section of which records rites that may be related to the later *zukru* rituals.¹⁷⁷

The active appearances of Šaggar are lacking in detail. In both cases, he is brought forth with another deity, apparently after having already processed with the rest of the divine population. He does not act alone: in the sixth year he is accompanied by Šaššabêttu and in the seventh by Dagan, himself.¹⁷⁸ But the function of this extra procession is not described. Perhaps it amounts only to an additional parade of the important deities; a kind of honorary circuit appropriate to their place in the festival. But, it may be the case that the gods undertake some further ritual activity that is simply not recorded in the text. When Šaggar appears on the 15th of the first month in the older six-month ritual text, he is taken “down to the house of cattle,” where he receives a sacrifice.¹⁷⁹ Such a rite may have to do with an association of the moon-god with the fertility of cattle, as is known for Sumerian Nanna—probably not unrelated to the horn-

¹⁷⁶ Emar 373:44, 171, and 187. The third of these fails actually to specific “the day” of Šaggar. Rather it only reads “On the 15th day—Šaggar—[etc.].” It is feasible that Šaggar in this case designates the deity Šaggar, rather than the name of the day, perhaps as an object of the verb *ušeššû*. However, the parallel instructions for the same day in line 44 make clear that Šaggar is not included among the objects of the verb and does in fact refer to the “Day of Šaggar.”

¹⁷⁷ There is no evidence that any other “Šaggar-day” existed outside of the first month of the year. Neither is it possible to sustain the oft-repeated assertion that Šaggar was also connected with the second day of the month at Emar, which would correspond to the last day of the new moon. That idea is based on and erroneous reading of Emar 373:171 (Arnaud line 176) as “[U₄].2.KÁM.” See instead Fleming’s collation drawing (*Time at Emar*, 299). Cf. Pomponio and Xella, *Les dieux d’Ebla*, 320; Stephanie Dalley and Beatrice Teissier, “Tablets from the Vicinity of Emar and Elsewhere,” *Iraq* 54 (1992): 91.

¹⁷⁸ In the first case, he is said to emerge with Šaššabêttu from the *bīt dug-li*. Since there was no prior indication that they should be placed in the *bīt dug-li*, it must be assumed either that they have permanent residence there or that they were previously located there in the course of some other, non-*zukru*-related ritual requirement. The latter is more likely considering the designation of Šaššabêttu as being “of Ninurta’s Temple,” which seems to suggest a location for her permanent abode.

¹⁷⁹ Emar 446:45-46.

shaped appearance of the crescent moon.¹⁸⁰ If such a rite were performed in the *zukru* rituals, it would be adding a dimension of livestock fertility to the agrarian concerns otherwise evident in the event. Such interests are really of a piece with one another: both represent the endeavors of Emar agriculturalists, broadly conceived to include animal husbandry, with impact on the economy and subsistence of the city.

Šaggar is a well-enough known Syrian lunar deity to make his popularity at Emar unremarkable.¹⁸¹ While syllabic spellings of the name or writings with the unique logographic designation, ^dHAR, are relatively rare, Emmanuel Laroche has shown through the comparison of hieroglyphic Hittite inscriptions on cylinder seals to their cuneiform labels that Šaggar can also be designated as ^d30 at Emar.¹⁸² ^d30 is an extremely

¹⁸⁰ Cf., e.g. ETCSL 1.8.2.1, 1.8.2.2, *et al.*

¹⁸¹ The oldest examples come from two Ebla texts that record the name ^dSa-nu-ga-ru₁₂ [ARET V 1:8; 4:4; cf. Pomponio and Xella, *Les dieux d'Ebla*, 319]. One of these localizes a center of worship for Šaggar at a city called má-NE^{ki}, known to be located on the Euphrates near Emar; cf. Alfonso Archi, “Studies in the Pantheon of Ebla,” *OrNS* 63 (1994): 255. Šaggar also appears a number of times in the OB texts from Mari and Tell al-Rimah. ^dHAR = ^dsaggár was lent to the designation of a mountain lying between Upper Mesopotamia and the Jazira, which still bears his name today (Jebel Sinjar). The name, as ^dHAR, occurs in a number of personal names from Mari. While that logogram is known to have designated the deity Buene, the reading HAR = *Saggar* was fleshed out by Marten Stol, *On Trees, Mountains, and Millstones in the Ancient Near East* (MVEOL 21; Leiden: Ex Oriente Lux, 1979), 75-80, based especially on an LB copy of proto-Diri (CT 29 45 ii 5-7) which gives the equivalence sag-gar = ^dHAR. Denis Soubeyran further suggested the reading HAR = *Saggár* for ARMT 16 1 in a variant writing of a GN that is elsewhere spelled syllabically [“Une graphie atypique de Saggārātum?” *M.A.R.I.* 3 (1984): 276]. The proposition was accepted by Jean-Marie Durand and extended also to the reading of HAR in Mari PNs (e.g. ^{md}saggár-a-bu-um, ARM 405:6, 24); “Noms de dieux sumériens à Mari,” *N.A.B.U.* (1987), 7-8. Contemporary with the Emar archives are two parallel texts—one in Akkadian and one in Ugaritic—from Ras Shamra that record a list of deities for receipt of sacrificial offerings [Akkadian: RS 92.2004:14 = RSO XIV 22; Ugaritic: KTU³ 1.148:31 = RS 24.643 = *Ugaritica* 5 V 9; cf. the side-by-side edition in Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 17-19. There, the Akkadian copy lists ^dHAR ù ^dGÎR in parallel to Ugaritic šgr w 'itm. It therefore appears that, at least in this case, Ugaritic Šaggar was a binomial deity with the god “Fire.” Šaggar also makes an appearance in the Ugaritic Ba'lu Cycle, though the context is so thoroughly broken that nothing can be said about his role there (KTU³ 1.5 iii 16, 17). The additional occurrence of alphabetic šgr at Ugarit in the Hurrian incantation KTU³ 1.131:13, as has already been observed by Manfred Dietrich and Walter Mayer, is more likely to be a type of vessel [“Hurritische Weihrauch-Beschörungen in ugaritischer Alphabetschrift” *UF* 26 (1994), 101]. Cf. Thomas Richter, *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen* (Wiesbaden: Harroassowitz Verlag, 2012), 372-73 s.v. šekarū “ein Kupfergegenstand.” The word is also attested in syllabic writing from Nuzi.

¹⁸² Emmanuel Laroche, “Les hieroglyphes de Meskene-Emar et le style ‘syro-hittite’,” *Akkadica* 22 (1981): 11. Laroche discovered the correspondence of cuneiform ^{md}30-a-bi with hieroglyphic Sà-ga+ra(?)=a-bu.

common element in Emarite personal names. Some of them may refer to other lunar deities such as Kušuḥ or Sîn, but the specification of Šaggar as the moon-god in local Emarite ritual suggests that most would refer to him.¹⁸³

But, despite the fact that Šaggar seems to have been a popular and well-known deity at Emar, it is important to note that, as a ritual actor, he is a unique feature of the *zukru* ritual (and the more ancient first-month rites that appear linked to it). In no capacity does he appear in any other ritual text. Just as with Dagan *bēl bukkari* and Šaššabêttu, here again, the *zukru* not only employs but treats with importance a god who is otherwise not known as a ritual participant. This observation only highlights the uniqueness of the *zukru* ritual and underscores the close-knit importance of its divine ensemble. These are no stock group of deities called to participate in the ritual *pro forma*. This unique cast of deities was brought together to represent a discrete set of interests that are advanced through the event's performance. The *zukru*'s divinity represents a celebration of gods who are perceived as able to grant agro-pastoral abundance.

The Deities of the Palace

¹⁸³ In her exhaustive work on Emarite Personal Names, Regine Pruzsinszky interprets the element ^d30 as referring to Šaggar in all cases unless any circumstantial peculiarities suggest otherwise. One such case is the name LUGAL-^d30 = Šarri-kusuh, where ^d30 denotes the Hurrian lunar deity [cf. Pruzsinszky, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar* (SCCNH 13; Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2003), 739-40]. The vocalization of this name, belonging to a king of Karkamiš, is known from other sources. Cases of ^d30 = Sîn occur especially when the document that contains the name is associated with House 5, a known headquarters of economic activity associated with southern Mesopotamia (cf. Pruzsinszky, *Personennamen*, 707). For a description of the character of House 5, see Yoram Cohen and Itamar Singer, "A Late Synchronism between Ugarit and Emar," 129-135.

In addition to the four primary gods of the *zukru* in its festival form—Dagan *bēl bukkari*, ^dNIN.URTA, Šaššabêttu, and Šaggar—a small cadre of deities associated with the palace appears among the principals for the most important occasions of sacrificial offerings, the 24th of Niqalu in the sixth year and the 15th of SAG.MU in the seventh. They are both times designated in the same order: ^dNIN-É.GAL-*li*, ^d30 *u* ^dUTU *ša* É.GAL-*li*.¹⁸⁴ Their animal offering portion is comparable to that which is given to the other three sacrificial recipients on those days. Their foodstuff allotment is tripled, which only indicates that each deity in the trio received a single full offering package, despite the fact that they evidently shared the animals. Unlike the other principal gods, who receive contributions from the king, the City, and the Temple of the Gods, the palace deities are supported only by the king. The withholding of support by the other sponsors is reasonable, given that these gods are explicitly named as associates of the monarch and thereby reflect a more limited political interest. But this fact is also revelatory for the nature of their participation: they are not perceived as beneficial or efficacious gods for the entire population. There is no need for the collective institutions to fund them since they harbor only the royal interest. As such, they can be seen as standing outside of the primary realm of the ritual's concern—a fact that is further noted by their complete lack of participation in the event outside of their conspicuously placed receipt of offerings.

¹⁸⁴ Outside of Emar 373+, this goddess is found in the sacrificial offering lists, Emar 378-382, the ritual for Ašartu of Combat (Emar 460:11), and an inventory of cultic rations (Emar 274:4). In the preparatory offerings for the 24th of Niqalu in the sixth year of the *zukru* cycle and in the hierarchical god-list, ^dNIN-É.GAL is separated from ^d30 and ^dUTU to stand alone. ^dUTU is not otherwise known to have occupied a conspicuous place in the Emar pantheon. Within the ritual corpus, he is mentioned twice in sacrificial lists (Emar 378, 380) and otherwise only in the fragment Emar 447:10. The latter text—a Conventional Format document—indicates that ^dUTU maintained a temple or installation (É) in Emar independent of ^d30, with whom he is coupled in the offering lists. In the rites for the gods of Hatti, the sun-god played a much more important role; cf. Emar 471:10; 472:34, 55; 473:6; 479:1.

Rather than supporting the agricultural aims of the festival, this triad of gods appears for the singular purpose of promoting the monarchy.

They are not the only deities associated with the palace to be honored in the ritual. The hierarchical god-list attests to a Dagan of the Palace (line 91), Išhara of the King (line 106), Ganana of the Palace (line 108), and the “two pair of Baliḫ-gods of the Palace Garden” (line 141, Emar 379:8). Especially the gods “of the Palace Garden” indicate that these deities are not simply associated with the monarchy as an abstract institution, but rather actually received cult within the walls of a palace building. The local palace appears to have been home to an actively attended cult, perhaps in a dedicated wing or shrine similar to that excavated in the royal palace of Qatna.¹⁸⁵

The model of Qatna is instructive for the main triad of palace gods in Emar, led by ^dNIN-É.GAL, since that goddess, who was prominent in Qatna, was associated with another deity in the Qatna cultic inventory texts. That deity was referred to as “the God of the King” and seems also to be the same deity called “the God of the Father(s)” in the texts.¹⁸⁶ Jean Bottéro, the editor of the Qatna inventories, identified this figure as ^dUTU, who is referred to by Akizzi, the last king of Qatna, as “the sun-god, the god of my fathers” (^dUTU DINGIR *a-bi-ia*).¹⁸⁷ This would account also for “I’abondance

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Mirko Novák and Peter Pfälzner, “Ausgrabungen in Tall Mišrife-Qatna 1999. Vorbericht der deutschen Komponente des internationalen Kooperationsprojektes,” *MDOG* 132 (2000): 253-96.

¹⁸⁶ *RA* 43 174:1; 178:43, 44 (all inventory II); 184:9 (inventory IV). Two of these (*RA* 43 174:1; 178:43) are marked for plurality (DINGIR^{mes} *šarri*; DINGIR^{mes} *ša a-bi*). However, for two reasons, Bottéro argues for a singular interpretation: (1) the other two, seemingly parallel references occur in the singular and, (2) the cases that name DINGIR^{mes} as the referent go on to describe the inventory with singular pronouns, e.g. bracelets on *his* right hand (174:5) or the weight of *his* pendant (178:43). See Jean Bottéro, “Les inventaires de Qatna,” *RA* 43 (1949): 33-34.

¹⁸⁷ EA 55: 53, 56, 59, 63, 66. Bottéro recognized the issue of ^dUTU’s ambiguous identity, but simply referred to him as Šamaš throughout (“Les Inventaires,” 35). He identifies what he thinks may be a local, Hurrian name of the sun-god in *RA* 43 178:41 (AO 12957), which refers to ^d*U-wu-ri-in-nu* in a parallel expression with *ili šarri/abi*. William Moran translated each instance of ^dUTU in this letter as “Šimige,” assuming that the Hurrian sun-god was worshipped in Qatna, which was, after all, heavily Hurrianized in the Late Bronze Age [*The Amarna Letters* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1992), 127-28]. In his more recent

extraordinaire” of solar disk amulets (*šamšatu*, *šaššinnu*) found in the inventories of ^dNIN-É.GAL’s cult, which “semble un témoignage éloquent de la célébrité du culte de *Šamaš* à Qatna.”¹⁸⁸ The sun-god’s permanent residence and cultic materials might have been shared with ^dNIN-É.GAL. If the pairing of a solar deity with the “Lady of the Palace” as benefactors of the royal institution was a broader LB Syrian phenomenon, then perhaps the same thought stands behind the association of these gods in Emar, albeit with the unique addition of the lunar god to the cohort.

What is, perhaps, unexpected about applying that model to Emar is that typically the local palace has been viewed as an institution of only modest prestige and strength. The *zukru* portrayal of a palace of the size, wealth, and importance that would accompany the maintenance of several permanent cultic installations, however, gives cause to suspect the existence of a somewhat powerful monarchy at the time of the festival version’s performance. The insertion of the palace deities, particularly the triad of ^dNIN-É.GAL, ^d30 and ^dUTU—having nothing to do with the actual plan of the ritual—amount to an advertisement of the palace wealth and a public show of its prominence, the underlying story of which must be a program of augmenting the power of a traditionally limited monarchy. Such a spectacle is a product of its historical setting in the political developments of Emar in the 13th century, which will be examined fully in Part II of this book.

A final observation about the major palace deities is the non-specific terms in which they are designated. ^dNIN-É.GAL, which stands for Bēlet-ekalli in central

edition of the Amarna texts, Anson Rainey avoids that assumption by translating “the sun god;” *The El-Amarna Correspondence Volume 1* (HdO 110; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 400-405.

¹⁸⁸ Bottéro, “Les Inventaires,” 34.

Mesopotamia, is a designation for the female deity who is considered a divine patroness for the palace, but whether that deity should be thought of as Mesopotamian Bēlet-ekalli or a different, local deity is shrouded by the writing.¹⁸⁹ The same is true for the celestial deities who accompany her: no indication of the identity of ^dUTU is given and ^d30 is used as the appellative of the lunar god, despite the fact that the moon-god Šaggar is specified (and written syllabically) in the *zukru* texts where the non-palace lunar god is designated. Unlike the specificity with which the other principals are named, the palace deities are described as categories: “the lady of the palace, the moon-god, and the sun-god of the palace.” The choice of these designations, which only appear in the festival version, may be aimed at creating an intentional universalism for the palace cult. They place the religion of Emar’s rulers in the context of the broader world, at once making themselves relatable to the greater powers of that world and projecting to their subordinates a higher level of connectedness and thus a broader base of power. Even the use of a palace cultic installation, which is in no way implied in earlier texts, might be seen as a form of elite emulation and, correspondingly, an attempt to occupy a stronger power position. These developments have a clear correspondence to the program of support for Emar’s local monarchy that was adopted by the ruling powers of Karkamiš in the mid-13th century, which will be further explored in Part II.

¹⁸⁹ A Goddess with the Ugaritic name Ba‘lat Bahatīma may have been the local version of ^dNIN-É.GAL in that city, though the precise nature of that deity remains disputed. See further Geetā De Clercq, “Die Göttin Ninegal/Bēlet-ekallim nach den altorientalischen Quellen des 3. und 2. Jt. v. Chr.” (PhD diss, Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg, 2003), 153. A Hurrianized form of the name Bēlet-ekalli, *pdgl* (KTU³ 1.42:48) seems to have received cult at Ugarit also. The vocalization of the name is suggested by KUB 27 13 I 20, ^d*Pé-en-ti-kal-li*. For a recent study of the Hurrian text in question, see Joseph Lam, “A Reassessment of the Alphabetic Hurrian Text RS 1.004 (KTU³ 1.42): A Ritual of Anointing of Deities?,” *JANER* 11 (2011): 148-169.

The Completeness of zukru Divinity

Although the ritual events and largest sacrificial offerings of the festival are focused on the small cast of deities described above, one of the most distinctive features of the *zukru* in its festival version is its inclusion of apparently the entire divine population of Emar's religious sphere. Nearly one hundred deities are named in the text with earmarks for sacrificial offering. Nothing nearly so ambitious, expensive, or comprehensive occurs anywhere else in Emarite ritual, including the earlier forms of the *zukru* ritual. Whatever else it is, the *zukru* festival is a moment of confrontation with Emar's pantheon, as it is conceived in the historical-political context of the event's performance.

There are three ways in which a passive crowd of divine participants appear in the festival text. One is simply through the designation of "all the gods" as the object of some action, which almost always has to do with being brought out in procession or being named as a group-beneficiary of the Glorification Ceremony's burnt sacrificial ewe. On the four most important ritual dates—the 15th of SAG.MU in year six, the 25th of Niqualu in year six, the 15th of SAG.MU in year seven, and the 21st of SAG.MU in year seven—"all the gods" seem to be a kind of divine audience for the ritual actions performed by the principals. In terms of the emic understanding of the ritual, their contribution is less than critical. The enormous impact of these gods' presence is realized more broadly in the ritual experience of the *zukru* and, correspondingly, in the political agenda that is pressed through that experience.

But, with greater specificity, non-primary gods are named on two ritual occasions. One is an apparently supplemental offering that occurs on the 24th of Niqualu in year six—

the day before the major sixth-year preparatory rites—dedicated to a select group of thirteen deities that includes all of the principal gods except Šaššabêttu.¹⁹⁰ Each of these gods receives a single restrained sheep and, additionally, a foodstuff offering is given to “all the gods.” The next, and more highly visible occurs in the main seventh-year event, for which the text provides the most extensive list of Emarite deities and their local manifestations.

What stands out about this list of thirteen deities is that it corresponds almost exactly to the uppermost tier in the long list of gods who receive sacrificial offerings during the seven-day main event—the final occasion upon which non-primary gods appear (see Table 9). That list contains a hierarchically ranked roster of deities, drawn into three tiers, preceded by an introduction that prescribes a seven-day period of worship (*palāhu*) for “all the gods of Emar.”¹⁹¹ The 24th of Niqalu gods are the first thirteen gods of the twenty enumerated in the first tier of the hierarchical list, given in the same ranks with only minor disparities.¹⁹²

Moreover, as Fleming recognized, this list of top-tier gods corresponds also to the names and fixed order of deities in the sacrificial god-list, Emar 378.¹⁹³ That text contains no other ritual instructions; only the list, itself, is inscribed on the tablet. But the unique

¹⁹⁰ The palace triad, ^dNIN-É.GAL, ^d30, and ^dUTU, appear, but are separated into individual entries. The latter two lack the localization of “the palace,” which they receive in the offerings for the major *zuku* days. Compared with the longer versions of the hierarchical god-list, it seems that this ^d30 and ^dUTU are *not* the ones that belong to the palace. Those two gods, specified as such, occur in the fourteenth and fifteenth ranks of the list, respectively.

¹⁹¹ It is unclear whether “worshipping” the gods is defined by the sacrificial list that follows—in which case a better translation of the verb would be “perform service to” the gods—or rather the sacrifices are only one facet of what constitutes “worship.”

¹⁹² Three are noted: (1) ^dUTU, who stands in sixth position in the hierarchical list, has been promoted to third position, (2) ^dUTU has been given an independent line, whereas he shares a line with ^d30 in the hierarchical list, and (3) where Aštartu of the Soldier stands in the twenty-fourth of Niqalu list, Aštartu *ša šubi* appears in the hierarchical list.

¹⁹³ Fleming, *Installation*, 243-44.

correspondence to the two Tier 1 lists in Emar 373+, as well as the overlap of many divine titles in the lower tiers show that this text can only be associated with *zukru* practice in the festival form.¹⁹⁴

Table 9. *Deities of the First Tier*¹⁹⁵

Rank	373:11-16	Rank	373:77-95	Rank	378:1-16
1	Dagan <i>bēl bukkari</i>	1	Dagan <i>bēl bukkari</i>	1	Dagan <i>bēl bukkari</i>
2	^d ISKUR	2	^d ISKUR	3	^d ISKUR
3	^d UTU				
4	[Dagan]	3	Dagan	2	Dagan kabar
5	(H)ayya (Ea)	4	(H)ayya (Ea)	4	(H)ayya (Ea)
6	^d 30	5-6	^d 30 and ^d UTU	5-6	^d 30 and ^d UTU
7	^d NIN.URTA	7	^d NIN.URTA	7	^d NIN.URTA
8	[Alal]	8	Alal	8	Alal
9	The Lord of Commerce	9	Rašap [Lord of Commerce]	9	Rašap Lord of Commerce
10	The Lord of Horns	10	Rašap [Lord of Horns]	10	The Lord of Horns
11	^d NIN.KUR	11	^d NIN.KUR	11	^d NIN.KUR
12	[^d NIN-É.GAL]	12	^d NIN-É.GAL	12	^d NIN-É.GAL
13	Aštartu of the Solider	13	Aštartu of <i>šubi</i>	13	[Aštartu of <i>šu</i>]bi
		14	^d 30 of the Pala[ce]	14	[^d 30 of] the Palace (?)
		15	^d UTU of Pala[ce]	15	[^d UTU of the Pal]ace(?)
		16	Dagan of the Pala[ce]	16	[Dagan of] the Palace
		17	Aštartu of [...]	17	[DN...]
		18	Aštartu o[f ...]	18	[DN...]
		19	Aštartu o[f ...]	19	[DN...]
		20	[DN...]	20	[DN...] ¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁴ This was already recognized by Arnaud, who numbered the text Emar 378 to follow directly his catalog of *zukru* materials, Emar 373-377.

¹⁹⁵ A similar table can be found in Fleming, *Installation*, 243-44. I have updated the presentation based on advances in his work (in *Time at Emar*) and my own.

¹⁹⁶ It is unclear whether Emar 378 brings a decisive end to the first tier at this point, since the text is broken at this point. That text does make use of rulings to divide its contents, indicating that the *zukru*'s tier system appertained in this list beyond the correspondence of the opening list of gods.

Apparently these preparatory offerings were provided to appease the gods on the occasion of their upcoming departure from their temples. But there is no sure answer to the question of why only gods from this list were given the additional offerings on the 24th of Niqualu. Perhaps it is simply based on their obviously high status among the other local gods. More perplexing is the question of why only five-eighths of the gods in the tier receive this special attention. Does the 24th of Niqualu list represent a truncating of the longer list? Or, conversely, does the shorter list represent a fundamental divine cadre in the reckoning of the text's composer, with the longer lists representing an expansion? Since the full names and titles of several of the dis-included gods are broken away in the longer versions of the list we cannot fully evaluate the significance of their absence. We might note, however, that at least three of these seven gods receive an appellative that associates them with the palace. If the same were to apply to the remaining four, then we could say that the royal interest is not attended in the 24th of Niqualu offerings. That would be a surprising conclusion, indeed, since the 24th of Niqualu offerings, in fact, derive from the king without assistance from the other sources of provision. Whether these offerings deliberately purge the palace interest or simply fail to incorporate them in the same way as for the longer list, the result is a gesture of conspicuous magnanimity on the part of the royal institution. The 24th of Niqualu attended to those gods that the citizens of the city held in common, such as ^dNIN.URTA, the city god, and other deities with clear relevance to broader swathes of the population such as (Rašap) the "Lord of Commerce" and Aštartu "of the Soldier."

The occasion for the complete listing of deities and their offering portions is not for preparatory activities but rather in the course of the main festival, itself.¹⁹⁷ The exact timing of this massive sacrificial event is difficult to ascertain. The list is introduced by the instruction to “worship all the gods of Emar for seven days,” which might indicate that these many offerings were performed between the main ritual days of the festival (the 15th and 21st). On the other hand, if the instruction to “give the sacrifices according to what is written on the tablet” on the 15th of the month refers to the hierarchical god-list offerings, then it may be the case that all of these sacrifices occurred on a single day, the inaugural day of the festival.¹⁹⁸

The introduction of the list with the statement concerning the worship of “all the gods of Emar” also raises the issue of whether the hierarchical god-list actually does represent “all the gods of Emar.” Once elsewhere in the text, the gods are referred to as “all *seventy* gods of Emar.”¹⁹⁹ At least eighty-five are named here, though the estimation of them as seventy surely reflects a schematic number that signifies completeness. Similarly, the fact that a number of deities, or aspects of deities, attested elsewhere in the Emar archives can be identified as absent from this text should not be understood as an

¹⁹⁷ The list is divided into three tiers, which progressively prescribe a decreasing quantity of sacrificial offerings for the constituent deities. The primary disparity in the offering packages is the number of animal victims prescribed. Tier 1 deities receive five calves and 10 *pure* lambs each while those of Tier 2 receive only five lambs (purity unspecified) and Tier 3 only two. In addition, each of the tiers receives a package of food-offerings of the Pattern 1 type (see page 124), with the porridge-bread portion of Tier 3 reduced by one *seah*. More than half the gods in the preserved list belong to the third tier. It is possible that a fourth tier existed in the broken space, though its content, after the necessary enumeration of the tier’s offering package, would be limited to a maximum of about sixteen deities. The outsized share of deities belonging to Tier 3, however, gives the impression that no further stratification among the gods is necessary and the remaining deities are simply lumped together.

¹⁹⁸ It does not seem to be the case that the enumerated sacrificial offerings are given on each of the seven days. See textual note 75, pages 145-47. However, it is possible that they could have recurred on the seventh day of the festival (21st of SAG.MU), considering the prescription to “perform the rites just as (for) the previous day” in line 204.

¹⁹⁹ Emar 373+:40.

indicator that the list was not understood to be exhaustive.²⁰⁰ In the first place, practically speaking, the broken nature of the present list prevents us from knowing for certain whether an absence is real or only perceived in the present state of the text. But the perception of completeness depends on the actual set of deities whose cult received active service at the time of the authorship of this particular text—a set that may have changed over the period attested in the archives. And, moreover, what is a complete picture of divinity for *zukru* might differ from completeness in another manifestation of local religion, especially since, as we will see, the festival version of *zukru* embodies a particular worldview that might also dictate its view of divinity.

Table 10. *Deities of the Third Tier*

Rank	Emar 373+:114-162	Rank	Emar 378:14-49 ²⁰¹
37	Lord of the Hill		
38	Dagan Lord of the Valley		
39	Dagan Lord of Šumi		
40	Dagan Lord of Buzqa		
41	Dagan Lord of Yabur		
42	Ašartu [...]		
43	[Adammatera of] the <i>bīt dug-li</i>		
44	[...]		
45	[...]		
46	the two [...]		
47	Mu[sanu(?)]		
48	Ša[ggar]		
49	The Lord of Ak[ka(?)]		
50	The Lord of I[mar(?)]		
51	^d ISKUR Lord of [...]		
52	Gašr[u]		

²⁰⁰ For example, Emar 274, a cultic administrative document, contains records of distribution of goods to several deities not attested in the present list, mixed among distribution to gods who are. They include ^dNIN.URTA of the Truth-“Gate,” Ašartu of Lightning, Dagan of Tuttul, Šarruma, and Ašartu of Šuparati. Some of those gods are also known actors in other Emarite rituals.

²⁰¹ Emar 378 is inscribed front and back, with the lower half of the obverse containing two columns. Half of the tablet is broken away, which makes a continuous count and rank of the listed deities impossible. Here I have labelled the gods of column II of the obverse as A 1-16 and the reserves as B 1-18.

53	The Lord of Shel[ter and Protection]		
54	Lord of Bu[zqa (?)]		
55	The Lord of Ya[bur (?)]		
56	The Lord of [...]		
57	[The Seven Divine Counselor]s of the Six City Gates	B10	The Seven Divine Counselors of the City Gates
58	[...]		
59	The Seven		
60	^d [x]-la-a-ba		
61	The Lord of Šagma		
62	^d IŠKUR of Bašima'a		
63	Nawarni		
64	The pair of Baliḥ-gods of the Palace Garden	A7	The pair of Baliḥ-gods of the King's Garden
65	^d NIN.URTA of Burnt Offerings	B16	[^d N]IN.URTA of Burnt [Offerings]
66	^d IŠKUR Lord of Imar	A11	^d IŠKUR Lord of Imar
67	^d NIN.URTA Lord of Kumari	B17	^d NIN.URTA Lord of Kumari ¹
68	Aštartu Lady of [...]		
69	The Baliḥ-gods of Huddanu (?)	A6	the Baliḥ-gods of Huddanu (?)
70	^d NIN.KUR Lady of the Wadi		
71	^d NIN.KUR Lady of the Region	A3	^d NIN.KUR Lady of the Region
72	Dagan Lord of Shelter and Protection		
73	Dagan Lord of the Guard		
74	The Baliḥ-gods of Wheat	B12	The Baliḥ-gods of Wheat
75	The Lord of Rabbâ	B14	The Lord of Rabbâ
76	^d NIN.KUR, Lady of Išpa'at	B15	[^d NI]N.KUR, Lady of Išpa'at
77	Dagan, Lord of Išpa'at		
78	Dagan Lord of ḥa-pa-[š]u(?)		
79	Li'[m]i-Šarta	A2	Li'mi-Šarta
80	^d NIN.KUR of the Gate of Li'mi-Šarta	A1	^d NIN.KUR of the Gate of Li'mi-Šarta
81	^d IŠKUR of the House of Fortune		
82	The <i>sikkānu</i> -stone of Ḫebat		
83	The Lord of Fluvial Land	A8	The Lord of Fluvial Land
84	[...]		
85	[...]		
		A4	Dagan <i>zi-ik-ri</i>
		A5	The Kašarātu of <i>iših</i>
		A9	The Lord of Yardani
		A10	Dagan lord of Mišla
		A12	Išhara lady of Tunannab
		A13	Išhara lady of Ḫusa

	A14	Išhara lady of Irar
	A15	The Lady of Išpa'at
	A16	[...]xx
	B1	[... <i>ku</i>] <i>rni</i>
	B2	[xx]x- <i>na ša kurni</i>
	B3	All the Rašaps of the city
	B4	The Baliḥ-gods and the Kašarāti
	B5	(H)ayya (Ea) of the scribes
	B6	Nabu of the schools
	B7	(H)ayya (Ea) of the blacksmiths
	B8	Aštar of the Star
	B9	The River
	B11	The gods of the seven zirāti-men
	B13	Ašartu Lady of Springs
	B18	[...] the mountain

The fluidity of divinity is underscored by comparison to Emar 378. The section of that text in which we would expect a list of second tier gods, if that text maintained such a division, is entirely broken away. What remains are thirty-four divine names or titles, thirteen of which correspond to names known from Emar 373+'s third tier list. In Emar 373+'s list—based on the estimated space of the broken bottom of column III above the inserted text of Emar 374, before which the god-list has come to completion—up to another eighteen lines could have existed. Assuming that each line contained a single deity, that estimation suggests a maximum original content of 101 deities. But the Emar 378 list contains twenty-one entries not attested in Emar 373+, with perhaps thirty or more additional lines broken away, clearly exceeding the length of Emar 373+'s version. Emar 378, which likely represents a separate, subsequent performance of the *zukru* festival, either existed in a divine milieu that was slightly different from that of the

authorship of 373+, or conceived of the parameters of completeness for the *zukru* with some modification.²⁰²

If we study in particular the deities in the list whose appellatives include localization at a particular city/town/village, recalling that these are all able to be considered “gods of Emar,” then Emar’s important role as a regional religious center emerges. This role highlights the fact that the religious functionaries of Emar (especially the Diviner of the Gods of Emar) exercised administrative authority over the cults not only in the main city but also in other towns in the region.²⁰³

Despite the length of the list, the variety of primary deities contained within it is not as great as it seems. Fifty-nine percent of the deities in the list are entitled aspects of gods listed elsewhere by name, alone (See Table 11).²⁰⁴ Four gods—Dagan, Ašartu, ^dIŠKUR, and ^dNIN.KUR—account for at least thirty-nine percent of the preserved list.²⁰⁵ That number increases to forty-five percent when the titles that lack a specified divine name but are likely to obtain among those couples are attributed. Thus the divine community of greater Emar is seen to revolve around a small core of primary gods, the hypostases, manifestations, or aspects of whom serve the specific needs of various communities and organizations.

²⁰² For the likelihood that Emar 378 represents a separate performance of *zukru* festival from that which instructed in Emar 373+, see pages 390-91.

²⁰³ That Emar was the religious center of nearby towns has already been suggested by Daniel Fleming, “A Limited Kingship: Late Bronze Emar in Ancient Syria,” *UF* 24 (1992): 68.

²⁰⁴ A few deities, such as Ašartu and Išhara, are never given without a title in the list. The list also contains a number of unnamed deities only described as “Lord/Lady of...” Assuming these are aspects of the well-known deities, I reckon them among those titles of primary gods.

²⁰⁵ These four gods might have been thought of as two divine couples—Dagan and ^dNIN.KUR beside Ašartu and ^dIŠKUR—since some evidence points towards consort relationships. However, such divine pairings may have been fluid, since Emar 378, itself, gives instead ^dNIN.LÍL as Dagan’s associate. Alternately, it is possible that ^dNIN.LÍL was a consort specifically for the *bēl bukkari* aspect of Dagan, while ^dNIN.KUR was thought of as Dagan’s mate, in general.

Table 11. *Multiple Attestations of Gods in the Hierarchical God-List*

Deity	Total	% of Total	Tier 1	% of Tier	Tier 2	% of Tier	Tier 3	% of Tier
Dagan	15	17.65%	3	15%	4	25%	8	16.33%
Ašartu	8	9.41%	4	20%	2	12.5%	2	4.08%
^d IŠKUR	5	5.88%	1	5%			4	8.16%
^d NIN.KUR	5	5.88%	1	5%			4	8.16%
^d NIN.URTA	3	3.53%	1	5%			2	4.08%
Šaggar/ ^d 30	3	3.53%	2	10%			1	2.04%
Išhara	3	3.53%			3	18.75%		
Baliḫ-gods	3	3.53%					3	6.12%
Rašap	2	2.35%	2	10%				
^d UTU	2	2.35%						
Ganana	2	2.35%			2	12.5%		

Table 12. *Deities Occurring Once in the Hierarchical God-List*

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
(H)ayya (Ea)	Anna	Adammatera
Alal	Ḫalma	Musanu (?)
^d NIN-É.GAL	Udḫa	Gašru
	Aštar	The Seven Divine Counselors
		The Seven
		Nawarni
		Li'mi-Šarta
		The <i>sikkānu</i> -stone of Ḫebat
		^d [x]-la-a-ba

Fourteen deities (16%) are associated with a specific place-name—sixteen (19%) if gods of “the City” are counted, though these may refer more properly to the city as an institution rather than the city as a geographical location. Six titles (7%) associate the named deity with natural features of the landscape such as valleys and hills. Eight gods (9%), dispersed among all three tiers, can be associated with the royal institution.

Ten deities in the list are designated only with a title, “Lord of ...,” rather than a proper divine name. This mode of god-naming is remarkable since, in four cases, a god bearing the same title but *with* a proper divine name has already been named in this very

list (within the same tier). So, on the one hand, the parallel titles appear to offer identifications of the gods who lack a specified divine name. Yet, on the other hand, such identifications would create unexpected redundancies in the list. Because this list served the practical function of managing distributions to the gods, what is clear is that each of the deities—even those with parallel titles—received separate sacrificial portions. Consequently, even if a known deity with a corresponding title is the intended party of the title-only gods, this manifestation of each god must have had multiple shrines in the region. Alternately, if a different god is intended, then perhaps it was the title itself that was primary to the particular manifestation of divinity, with attachments to one or another known god arising secondarily and perhaps variably.

Table 13. *Divine Titles without Divine Names and Possible Attributions*

Title	Possible Attribution	Cross-Reference
Lord of Akka		
Lord of Imar	^d IŠKUR	Emar 373:143
Lord of Shelter and Protection	Dagan	Emar 373:149
Lord of Buzqa	Dagan	Emar 373:117
Lord of Yabur	Dagan	Emar 373:118
Lord of [...]		
Lord of Šagma	Rašap or Erra	CM 13 29:14 or Emar 289:6
Lord of Rabbâ		
Lord of Fluvial Land	Dagan	Emar 169:4
Lord of the Hills		

The most important observation that emerges from scrutiny of the god-list is its truly local character. The great majority of the list relates deities who are distinctly Syrian, or whose cults in Syria are known to have an extensive history. The few exceptions to this characterization include Alal and the *Sibitti* from Mesopotamia and Nawarni from the Hurrians; the circumstances of importation of such gods are less well-

understood. Moreover, it is of special interest that the list demonstrates a complete lack of Hittite gods. It appears that “all the gods of Emar” (if that is indeed what the list represents) did not include the gods of Emar’s suzerain, despite the fact that rituals designed specifically for the care of Anatolian gods are also attested in the Emar archives.

The tiered structure of the divine catalog is an element unique to the *zukur* festival that is not likely to reflect any permanent conception of ranked divinity in Emarite religion. The other sacrificial lists, Emar 379-384, attest to different orders of deities and other ritual texts determine their own scheme of divinity with respect to the event recorded, rather than by reference to any fixed hierarchy of gods. The ranking of deities in Emar 373+ and 378 appears to be, rather, a bureaucratic phenomenon born of the practical need to manage the expenses of the already costly event by progressively limiting the amounts of sacrificial goods to be distributed. Obviously, this process still involved a value judgment of the relative importance of each deity with respect to the event, but that judgment may have been left to discretion of the author of the text, the Diviner, who presumably would have managed the actual event, as well.²⁰⁶ The discretionary nature of the composition also helps to account for the differences in the organization of Emar 373+ from 378, which appears to have been written by a subsequent holder of the office of Diviner.

The practical matter of managing the disbursement of funds for a ritual that includes offerings for the region’s entire divine population raises the ultimate question of the god-list: why did all the gods of the city and its environs need to be included in the

²⁰⁶ For the authorship and date of the text, see pages 383-95.

zukru festival? The question is especially pressing considering that there is no indication in the older, shorter *zukru* version or the likely forerunner to Emar's *zukru* (Emar 446) that any extensive body of deities played a role. In fact, in the shorter *zukru*, only Dagan, and possibly ^dNIN.URTA and ^dNIN.KUR are active, with Šaggar additionally mentioned only for the designation of "Šaggar-day." The extensive naming of other gods and, apparently, their passive participation in the event is an innovation of the festival version. The likely reasons for the introduction of this feature cannot adequately be explained in terms of the ritual, itself. It was, rather, a product of its historical circumstances and, as such, will be discussed more fully, below.

The Ritual Transaction: Donations to the Gods

The *zukru* festival is, above all, a sacrificial ritual. The majority of its activities are related to donating provisions to the gods. In itself, such a focus does not make the festival unique; the Emarite cult, like its ancient Near Eastern and Anatolian counterparts, was predicated on care of the gods through sacrifice. But several features make the *zukru* festival's program of ritual offerings stand out in marked distinction to that which is known elsewhere in Emarite rituals. The most striking of these features is the grand scale of its offerings: the wealth represented by the *zukru* festival is unparalleled in Emar's ritual corpus by a wide margin. From the budgetary perspective of any other ritual event, the commitment of resources to the *zukru* festival seems unimaginable: it outspent all other recorded rituals combined. In no small part, the outlandish expense of the festival is tied to the comprehensive scope of divine recipients, all of whom participated in this grand ritual event. The *zukru* festival is the only event in Emarite ritual that demands the

inclusion of the city's entire divine population, naming the gods individually in what amounts to an impressive show of numinous presence. And in addition to its outsized proportions and distributions of ritual offerings, the kinds of offerings the *zukru* festival provides and some of the ritual vessels in which it presents them are also distinctive, creating a unique ritual syntax for the donations to the gods. These elements, among others, make the discussion of the *zukru* festival's sacrificial system fundamental to understanding the importance of the event in Emarite religious life. The gods who receive the ritual donations, the sources of the ritual supplies, and the types of offerings provided along with their mode of presentation will be discussed in turn.

Like the other ritual texts, donations to the gods are usually indicated with the verb *naqû* (SISKUR), "offer." On one occasion in the text, there is special mention of a "bronze knife" (GÍR ZABAR), which was undoubtedly the implement of slaughter for the animals that are offered to the gods. Although such an item is not noted elsewhere in Emar ritual, it is likely to have been the standard sacrificial tool in all cases.²⁰⁷ Bronze knives are counted in several cultic inventory texts, among other paraphernalia such as braziers, cups, and bowls.²⁰⁸ Presumably, these items were for active utilization in service of the deity, which implies that the knives would have been used for the slaughter and preparation of offerings.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁷ By no means was the use of bronze knives restricted to cultic functions, however. Several texts that inventory the personal property of individuals or households reveal the presence of (sometimes multiple) such tools. Cf. CM 13 21:2; Emar 33:10. The latter specifies bronze knives manufactured in two different regional traditions—of Hatti and of Assyria.

²⁰⁸ CM 13 28:3, 4; *ASJ* 14 48:2, 3; Emar 285:1; 290:2. In the latter two instances, Arnaud transcribes ŠEN, though his text copies show the correct reading to be GÍR.

²⁰⁹ It is also possible that the knives are ceremonial objects or even votive offerings provided by worshippers. This is clearly the case in one text, Emar 286:6, which inventories a golden knife (GÍR GUŠKIN). The co-occurrence of bronze knives in inventories with additional goods that do not serve an obvious practical function in the cult, such as bronze stars, arrowheads, and bows, could also suggest that the knives are not for regular usage.

But, some of the *zukru* festival's sacrificial terminology indicates an additional layer of complexity to the act of donating animals to the gods. Such is the case of the verb *pa'ādu*, which refers to “restraining” sheep with the apparent intent of slaughtering them as sacrifices.²¹⁰ In the *zukru* festival, this act always occurs on days of preparation, on the eve of the major calendrical events (24th of Niqualu, 14th of SAG.MU, 20th of SAG.MU). Restraining animals on a prior day is also a feature of the six-month ritual calendar in at least two instances (Emar 446:59, 107), but elsewhere the day-in-advance nature of the act seems not to apply (e.g. Emar 375:3, 11; 392:4).

However far in advance it is accomplished, the practice of restraining sheep is certainly a part of a larger sacrificial procedure. But the sheep that are restrained on preparatory days of the *zukru* festival are not the very same that are prescribed as sacrifices for the next day. This is evinced by the poor correspondence between the animals listed for restraint and those listed for sacrifice the next day in both number and type. Moreover, as the administrative tally of animals for the sixth year Consecration Days demonstrates (line 33), the restrained animals are counted *in addition to* the other sacrificial animals (see Table 16). “Restraining” the animal is, thus, shorthand for both restraint and sacrifice. While it is unavoidable that the restrained sheep would ultimately be slaughtered—even perhaps on the day of the main ritual event—it is important to note that the restrained animals augment the main quantity of offerings. This might suggest

²¹⁰ This is against the interpretation of Arnaud, who suggests “offre” as a translation, presumably based on context. CAD P s.v. *pa'ādu*, a lemma limited to Emar, gives the same meaning. Fleming has already noted the likelihood that the verb simply corresponds to the standard Akkadian middle-weak *pādu* “to fetter, imprison” (*Time at Emar*, 60). Despite the fact that good parallels for that action in ritual are unavailable, there is nothing to suggest that the known meaning of the word, which is intelligible in the context, should be altered. The only non-ritual use of the term at Emar is found in Emar 16:10, where its meaning is exceptional, in any interpretation, and does not illuminate the best understanding of the ritual usage. On that text, see Jean-Marie Durand, review of *Recherches au Pays d'Aštata, Emar VI, Textes sumériens et accadiens, vol 1, 2 et 3* by Daniel Arnaud, *RA* 83 (1989), 174; Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 61-62.

that the act of restraint holds a distinct ritual significance—that restraining the animal in advance has a symbolic function not present in other sacrificial offerings.

The translation of *pa'ādu* as “restrain” is intended to capture the ambiguity of its meaning in these texts. In standard Akkadian, the verb (*pādu*) indicates “fettering” or “imprisoning.” Although it is not normally used in reference to animals, either implication could illuminate Emar’s use of the term in ritual. On the one hand, the rite may simply involve corralling sheep into a designated place for use at another time, thus “confining” them.²¹¹ But it is also possible that the action is one of physical binding. Trussing the legs of sacrificial victims is a known element of some ancient sacrificial procedures.²¹² In ancient Judaism, it is described in Tractate Tamid of the Babylonian Talmud: “They did not use to tie up the lamb but they strung its legs together. Those on whom the lot fell for the limbs took hold of it. It was strung up in such a way that its head was to the south while its face was turned to the west, and the slaughterer stood to the east of it with his face turned to the west.”²¹³ Such an example attests not only to the practice of binding the victim’s legs, but also illustrates the ritualized nature of the binding, itself.²¹⁴ If the act of restraining the animal held a particular ritual significance in

²¹¹ So Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 60, translating “enclose.” He raises an enticing comparison with the Hittite practice of driving animals into the temple for consecration before slaughter elsewhere (p. 63 and n.46). This understanding is a reversal of his acceptance of Arnaud’s definition (“to offer”) in his earlier work, *Installation*, 121.

²¹² The practice persists to the present, as can especially be observed in the slaughtering of the Islamic *qurbani*, where three of the victims’ legs are tied together.

²¹³ *m. Tamid* [Isidore Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud: seder ḳodashim in Three Volumes, volume III* (London: Soncino Press, 1948), 22].

²¹⁴ While a correspondent practice is never described in the Hebrew Bible’s sacrificial procedures, the narrative incident known as the “binding of Isaac,” where Isaac is bound (‘*āqad*) before his imminent sacrifice, may also reflect the currency of tying up sheep, the more common sacrificial victims, for slaughter. The Septuagint translation of ‘*āqad* with συμποδίζω specifies binding of the limbs together, making verbally explicit what is already clear in the Hebrew context: that the victim is trussed rather than tied to an object.

the Emarite cult, then it would not be surprising for it to appear as a separately designated action.²¹⁵

Apparently the restraining of the animals did not occur at the place of their ultimate fate, since they were “distributed” (*zâzu*) among the gods on the same days they were restrained (lines 186-87, 195-96). The distribution on a preparatory day—before the gods were brought out for the processional events —means that the restrained sheep were sent to the various temples or shrines of the gods and presumably slaughtered there as a preparatory sacrifice for the deity’s upcoming exit from his/her abode.²¹⁶

While the sacrificial offering of animals and even the ritual restraining of sacrificial victims are attested elsewhere in Emarite ritual, a truly distinctive feature of the *zukru* sacrificial scheme is the prescription to burn or roast (*qalû*) the slaughtered animal.²¹⁷ In each case, the animal is a ewe, which is burned or roasted during the Glorification Ceremony (lines 37, 63, [167]), an event that is well-attested elsewhere in the ritual corpus, though never with the prescription to burn/roast. If the ewe was roasted, then the meat of the slaughtered animal may have been intended, at least in part, for human consumption.²¹⁸ After all, the directive occurs under the heading “when they feast” (*kîmê ikkalû išattû*, lines 34, 60) and is immediately followed by the prescription

²¹⁵ 373+:40 uses *pa’ādu* at the conclusion of a list of donations that includes more than just animals. Even in this case, I suspect that the verb is meant to describe the treatment of the main part of the offering, the seventy pure lambs that are mentioned there. Still, the ambiguity of the term is well-illustrated here, where it can be broad enough to include the preparation of other sacrificial goods, as well.

²¹⁶ “Distribution” of offerings is typical of Emarite ritual terminology, especially when a broad swath of recipients is intended. The act does not necessarily imply preparation for a later event, as its context *zukru* festival text insinuates. Rather, offerings can be distributed among the gods at the time of their offering in a primary ritual act (cf. Emar 369C:19; 452:2, 7, et al.).

²¹⁷ Besides not occurring elsewhere in the ritual corpus, the verb is never used in any other document from Emar.

²¹⁸ For the unique occurrence of roasting (*šālā*) as the means of preparation for a sacrificial offering intended for human consumption in the Hebrew Bible, see Exod 12:9.

for items, including “the meat,” to “go back up into the city” (lines 37, 64). A potential parallel to roasting meats in the *zukru* might be found in the shorter version, which may mention “roasting” (*šamû*) and “roasted meat” (*šumme*).²¹⁹

But it is also possible, even likely, that the text envisions here a wholly burnt offering. This would be in keeping with statement that the ewe is to be burnt (*qalû*) “for all the gods” and with the apparent overall prestige of the Glorification Ceremony. Additional evidence to this effect may be found in the divine title ‘^dNIN.URTA *maqalî*,’ which I understand to designate a ^dNIN.URTA “of burnt offerings.” If this interpretation is correct, then the divine title not only adds evidence to the existence of such wholly burnt offerings in the Emar cult, but also indicates that *qalû* is, in fact, a lexical indicator of that type of offering. Burnt offerings are otherwise known to have been used in the Emar cult in cases designated by the verb *šarāpu*,²²⁰ which also refers to burnt sacrificial offerings at Ugarit.²²¹ Even if a burnt offering was offered here, in practice the ewe was probably not actually *wholly* burnt. At least the fat seems to have been removed for use in the ritual practice of anointing the *sikkānu*-stones.²²²

A final sacrificial term, attested only once in the text (and uncertainly, due to broken context), further supports the idea that some animals were offered as burnt offerings in the *zukru* festival. My tentative reading of line 183 indicates that sacrificial victims be “turned to smoke” (*qatāru*). In standard Akkadian the verb is limited to the offering of incense—unsurprisingly since burnt offering is not a typical feature of core

²¹⁹ Emar 375A:10, 19, 32. For the difficulties associated with reading these words, see pages 41-42.

²²⁰ 463:9; 471:33; 472:1, 14, 15, 18, 24, 28.

²²¹ Cf. Dennis Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 267.

²²² See further the discussion of the anointing practices, pages 83-88. In the biblical burnt offering, the entirety of the animal is immolated, in contrast, for instance, to the well-being offering, where the fat and some organs are removed for burning. The Emarite procedures for burnt offerings, however, may reflect a system in which removal of fat does not detract from perceiving an offering as wholly burnt.

Mesopotamian cults. In the west, however, a broader usage is known. The Hebrew Bible uses the verb (*qāṭar*) liberally to refer to the burning of various kinds of sacrificial offerings, including animal victims.²²³ In using both *qatāru* and *qalû* to designate burnt offerings, the text parallels its use of other near-synonyms for referring to the same ritual actions, such as its alternation between *pašāšu* and *ṭerû* to refer to the act of anointing.

The Sponsors of the zukru Festival

All of the instructions for the performance of the *zukru* festival are formulated in the third person plural with no subject expressed.²²⁴ Human participants are not specified as the subject of ritual action, with only two exceptions in which actions are performed by “the people,” an equally impersonal designation.²²⁵ This method stands in some contrast to other Emarite rituals, which name at least some ritual actors with specificity. On the one hand, the lack of individuated players in the *zukru* festival in favor of group action might indicate an ethic of inclusivity for the event in terms of human participation. In light of the exhaustiveness of the festival’s treatment of the gods, such an effort towards inclusion would not at all be out of place. But, on the other hand, this observation is tempered by comparison to Emar 452 and 463, calendrical rituals that seem to form a kind of textual group with Emar 373+, which evidence the same

²²³ Cf. Lev 1:9, 13, 15.

²²⁴ It is possible that “the Emarites” (DUMU^{mes} kur *E-mar*) potentially designated in the (now-lost) beginning of the text and mentioned again in 373+:169, are thought to be the subject, throughout. While that is possible, it does not offer a grammatical explanation for the same third person plural forms in 375+, which gives the subject as “the city of Emar” (^{uru}*E-mar*^{ki}). It is possible that in the latter case the subject is thought to be collective, and so is given a plural verbal form. On the other hand, it is not inconceivable that it is a grammatically impersonal form, functionally equivalent to the passive voice, which is known especially to be expressed in the third person plural in Aramaic.

²²⁵ Emar 373+: 42. Gods, on the other hand, can be the expressed subjects of ritual action; e.g. “[Dagan] will go to “NIN.URTA” (line 175).

phenomenon of limiting descriptions of ritual action to the third person plural without an expressed subject, as well. It therefore seems that this method of ritual prescription reflects a type of textuality rather than a ritual ethos.

But, while individual persons do not appear in this text as ritual actors, specific people or groups of people, in terms of the institution they constitute, are designated throughout in their capacity as festival sponsors. These include the king, who is twice designated in terms of his institution, the palace; the city; and an institution called the Temple of the Gods.²²⁶ As the following analysis demonstrates, the king is by far the most prodigious supplier of goods for the festival, such that it would not be incorrect to say that, in terms of sponsorship, the *zukru* festival is the king's event, despite the fact that he in no way is described as directly participating.²²⁷ The contributions of the other two institutions are so relatively paltry as to appear token. But the very fact that they persist as contributors demonstrates their perceived value to the event, which we must strive also to appreciate.

Understanding the implications of royal sponsorship of the *zukru* festival, which is not a feature of the shorter *zukru* ritual, is a crucial issue for interpreting the festival in its political-historical circumstances. That discussion, however must be deferred until after a picture of Emar's political history in the 13th century is described and the role of the king

²²⁶ That "the king" and "the palace" are alternate designations of the same entity—at least insofar as the extraction of resources is concerned—is demonstrated by the offering package enumerated in lines 76-77. The set corresponds to a Pattern 1 foodstuff offering, which is otherwise always provided by the king. We might additionally note the interchangeability of "king" and "palace" in the designation of the *Baliḥ*-gods which are called *Baliḥē ša kiri ekalli* in Emar 373:141 but *Baliḥē ša kiri ša šarri* in the *zukru*-related sacrificial list, Emar 378:20. Alternation between "the king" and "the palace" as a designation for what is apparently the same source of offerings is also characteristic of Emar 452.

²²⁷ The surprising absence of the king from *zukru* events (indeed Emar ritual, generally) in light of his generous sponsorship has already been well documented and discussed. See, e.g., Fleming, "A Limited Kingship," 60-62.

can be viewed in context. The objective here is rather to give an analytic overview of the king's contributions to the festival and to enlighten his role as a participant elsewhere in the Emarite ritual corpus.

Table 14. *Total Provisions in Emar 373 and Their Sources*

Offering Material	King / Palace	City	Temple of the Gods
Calves	50 ²²⁸		
Sheep	37 [+]	3	
Lambs	375	14	
Pure Lambs	70 [+]		
Ewes	3		
Porridge Bread	50 seah 100 <i>qa</i>		6 seah 7 <i>qa</i>
Barley Bread	100 [+]		4 seah 5 <i>qa</i>
ḪA-vessels	94		5
<i>kurkurru</i> (of Wine)	100		
<i>ḥuppar</i>	8		3
<i>pīḫu</i>	5		1
Thick Bread	4		
Birds	[]		

In contrast to his city and temple counterparts, the king purveys all manner of ritual goods. The two remaining groups serve more specialized functions, with the city providing only animals and the Temple of the Gods only non-animal foodstuffs. To

²²⁸ Because the king is the only purveyor of calves for the festival, his total bovine contribution should equal the final tally of calves (50) in line 206. Only seventeen of these can be counted in the preserved text.

illustrate how trivial the non-royal contributions are, consider the common ritual item, *pappāsu*-bread: the king donates nearly nine times the quantity given by the Temple of the Gods. The offerings of the city and the Temple of the Gods are always supplementary to those given by the king; never do they donate an item that is not also given by the king. Conversely, the king is the exclusive provider of several goods, such as calves, which would have been the most prestigious and expensive of the offering materials.

The main factor in the outsized portions provided by the king is his solitary position as offering donor in the period of offerings for the eighty-five or more gods of the hierarchical god-list and, in all likelihood, for the top-tier deities on the 24th of Niqualu in year six.²²⁹ In addition, the king is the sole supporter of the main palace deities, Bēlet-ekalli, ^d30 and ^dUTU of the Palace, for offerings associated with procession and feasting days.²³⁰

The king reprises his role as financier in the aforementioned calendrical rituals, Emar 452 and 463, the format of which echoes the funding scheme of Emar 373+. But, in contrast to the *zukru*, in these other calendrical rituals, so far as they are preserved, the king does not stand out as the premier financial sponsor. Rather, his contributions are commensurate with those of the Temple of the Gods in quantity and range of goods provided. The ostentatious ritual display of the king's wealth is a unique and notable feature of the *zukru*'s festival version.

²²⁹ There is no source specified for each sheep that is designated on the twenty-fourth of Niqualu for the primary deities, though the phrase “ša LUGAL” can be observed prior to the list following the initial lacuna. The intact text may have specified a total number of sheep to be provided by the king before detailing their distribution among the selected gods.

²³⁰ Emar 373:29-32, 57-58. The tripled portion of foodstuff offerings in these sections is to facilitate a single, complete offering package to each of the three palace deities and should not be understood as an increase over the portion ascribed to other gods.

Outside of the calendrical rituals, the king can be found with a more active role in rituals. In the installation rituals, he is included as an honored guest for feasting rites.²³¹ Notably, in the installation of the NIN.DINGIR-priestess, the other named attendees are all cultic functionaries: the previous (i.e. deceased) NIN.DINGIR-priestess, the NIN.DINGIR-priestess of Šumi, and the *maš'artu*-priestess.²³² Despite the limited visibility of the king in Emarite ritual, as compared to that of Ugarit, for instance, his inclusion among such company seems to suggest a system in which the king is seen in some measure as a necessary participant in rituals.²³³

In contrast to the *zukru*'s utilization of the king for provision of offerings, he is rather the recipient of certain sacrificial portions in several texts. His profits include the kidneys of an ox (369:58; 446:113²³⁴; 447:3), half the intestines of an ox (388:63), and, once, “all the vessels” that were used in the course of a ritual performance (394:42).

A single ritual in the corpus can be described as explicitly royal in its concerns, as stated in its own incipit: the “*imištu* of the king” (Emar 392). The rite may beseech protection for the king on the occasion of travel or, perhaps, military excursion and seems to require the king's active participation, though very little of the text remains.²³⁵

²³¹ Emar 369:17; 371:7; cf. also 402:4.

²³² In Emar 369A, only, the King of Šatappi is also included among the guests of the feast.

²³³ The king is also described as “consecrating” (*quddušu*) offerings during the *kissu*-festival for Dagan (Emar 385:25-26) and the *henpa* of oxen (Emar 394:41; cf. also the broken text of Emar 386:22, 23). The exact significance of the consecration is unclear, though it should be noted that the king performs it along with the Diviner and the chief scribe, at least one of whom is also not an explicitly cultic official. If the thrust of “consecrating” in these cases is a more literal sense of “setting apart” for cultic usage, then these texts may, in their own way, also seek to utilize the individual wealth of high officials as a source of cultic financial support.

²³⁴ Line 76 in Arnaud's edition.

²³⁵ Fleming suggests the root *namāšu* “to depart” underlies the otherwise unknown term *imištu* (“A Limited Kingship,” 63).

Appearing much more seldom than the king as purveyors of ritual provisions are the entities called the Temple of the Gods (É DINGIR-*li*)²³⁶ and the City (URU.KI), which work together to supplement the royal offerings. These organizations appear only to have provided offerings on the grandest days of the festival cycle: the 25th of Niqualu in year 6 and the 15th of SAG.MU in year 7.²³⁷ The enumeration of both events in Part I of the text follow a common format: procession of the primary deities, specific offering details for each deity, and provision “for the people.” On both occasions the offerings of the City and the Temple go to support Dagan, ^dNIN.URTA, and Šaššabêttu.

While Dagan and Šaššabêttu receive an equal amount of provisions from the Temple of the Gods in each case, it is striking that ^dNIN.URTA receives a smaller portion from the Temple than what is owed to the other gods. A similar reduction in portions can be observed in the king’s offering of animals to ^dNIN.URTA: whereas Dagan and Šaššabêttu receive calf offerings as well as sheep on the 25th of Niqualu, ^dNIN.URTA receives only sheep. This apparent devaluation is truly surprising, given ^dNIN.URTA’s prominent role in the ritual and, indeed, in the city, generally. Perhaps because ^dNIN.URTA was closely aligned with city affairs—that is, with the collective town government—the other sponsors were under less of a burden to support him. In such a

²³⁶ That the second element of the phrase É DINGIR-*li* represents a plural noun is demonstrated beyond all doubt by Emar 369A:94 (Fleming, *Installation*, line 90), which reads “É DINGIR^{meš}.” Cf. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 37.

²³⁷ The Temple of the Gods is found as a source in Emar 373+: [3], 21, 24, 27-28, 50, 53, 55-56. The provisions “for the people” occurs in line 51. The feast prescribed in line 22 does not preserve a source for its provisions, though given the analogous format of the fifteenth of SAG.MU feast, it is possible that the Temple of the Gods supplies it. However, the issue of the feast is raised again in notations for the same day in line 32, where the provision amounts are the same and source is specified as the palace. This may suggest that the twenty-fifth of Niqualu feast enjoys royal sponsorship, instead. The Temple may have been a source of provisions on the 15th of SAG.MU in the 6th year also, if my restoration of the beginning of column I is correct. The City is the source of goods in Emar 373+:19, 23, 26, 48, 52, 54). This institution never provides goods for the feast of the people, presumably since the allocation “for the people” never includes animal offerings.

case, however, we might expect the City to supplement the diminished portions rather than allow the god to suffer a shortage of provisions., but in fact the City's contribution remains unchanged.

Outside of Emar 373, the Temple of the Gods is mentioned in seven compositions, all of which belong to the ritual genre.²³⁸ These attestations add only modestly to the picture of the Temple's overall function. Once again, Emar 452 and 463—and only these two texts—utilize the Temple of the Gods in a manner familiar from the *zukru* materials: as a source of non-animalian foodstuffs for sacrificial offerings. Like the *zukru* provision lists, these two texts combine offerings sourced from the Temple of the Gods, the palace, the *nupuhannū*, and, in the case of Emar 463, the City. But the content of the offerings in these texts are much less rigidly fixed and the contributions of the various institutional sources do not neatly complement one another in the same way as in Emar 373. In Emar 452—rites for the month of Abû—the Temple of the Gods is the most frequent and most generous provider of goods in the preserved text.

Table 15. *Offering Inventories Sourced from the Temple of the Gods*

Offering Material	Emar 373+	Emar 452	Emar 463
porridge bread	6 seah, 7 <i>qa</i>	1 seah, 2 <i>qa</i> [+]	1 <i>qa</i>
barley bread/flour	4 seah, 5 <i>qa</i>	3 seah [+]	1 seah, 1 <i>qa</i>
ḪA-vessels	5	[?]	
<i>ḥuppar</i>	3		
<i>pīḫu</i>	1	4	
<i>šinaḫilu</i>		3 ½ <i>qa</i>	
<i>ḥizzibu</i> (of wine)		2	1
beer			?

²³⁸ Emar 369C:85; 369A:86; 372:12; 375A:53 (= 428:3) // 375C¹:19 (= 449:6) // 401:2 (= Emar 375 B/D?); 392:4; 446:13; 452:3, 22, 24, 29, 31, 47, 54; 463:24.

The only other clear reference to the Temple as a provider of goods comes from Emar 369C, where, instead of providing goods for ritual processes, the institution is placed in charge of furnishing the NIN.DINGIR-*priestess* with her annual stipend.²³⁹ In addition to basic grain rations, the NIN.DINGIR's portion includes a number of luxury items, including wool, oils, perfumes, dairy products, clothing, and a large variety of fruits.²⁴⁰ That the Temple of the Gods disburses such items in support of cultic personnel is suggestive of the wealth of the organization and one of its functions as an administrative hub. Notably, the Temple of the Gods is absent from this role in Emar 369A, where the rations instead stem from the *bīt dug-li*. The place called *bīt dug-li* appears in four of the ritual texts, with only a minimally visible role in the *zukru* festival.²⁴¹ The *zukru* hierarchical god-list associates the place with the goddess Adammatera, which seems to imply that a representation of her was a permanent denizen there. That connection is underscored by the offering of a sacrifice to Adammatera in the

²³⁹ Emar 369C:85. The Temple of the Gods may be a source of offerings in 372:12 and 446:13, though these are too broken to understand the context of the Temple's appearance.

²⁴⁰ Emar 369:85-90. Exemplar A of the text allots the NIN.DINGIR's grain portions from the *bīt dug-li*, while exemplar C sources everything from the Temple of the Gods.

²⁴¹ *DUG-li* represents the more common orthography for the term in question, though *TU-UK-li* appears, as well. While the latter may suggest the reading *tùk-li* for the former, lack of clarity on the term's meaning combined with the fact that */tùk/* is not a sign-value otherwise attested at Emar caution against exceeding the simplest reading of signs most commonly used to write the term. Though Arnaud did not translate the phrase in any of its occurrences, he transcribed it as É *tùk-li*, apparently perceiving a connection to Akkadian *tuklu*, "help," which is only sparsely attested in texts of the second millennium. Manfred Dietrich suggested that the meaning of *tuklu* in this case is a hitherto unattested derivation of the verbal root **tkl*, which implies, more broadly, "trust, confidence." Thus, for him, the *bīt tukli* is a "Haus des Vertrauens," i.e. "ein 'Vorratshaus'" ["Das Ensetzungsritual der Entu von Emar (Emar VI/3, 369)"] *UF* 21 (1989): 81 n. 72]. Fleming's "House of Assistance," which he proposes only tentatively (*Time at Emar*, 40 n. 95), is based on a less ambitious reading of the same term. I prefer a derivation from *dagālu* since the orthography favors that root, though no Semitic substantive *duglu* is otherwise known. If *duglu* is the correct rendering of the word, perhaps it takes its meaning from the use of *dagālu* for "attending to," i.e. "providing for" (CAD D s.v. *dagālu* mng. 2b). That would at least match the function of the place as a source of cultic provision and be a semantic equivalent to Dietrich's understanding of the place as a storehouse. But since the scanty data produces a mixed picture of the location's function and the terminology is otherwise unknown, I rather refrain from assigning the name any definitive meaning.

installation festival for the NIN.DINGIR.²⁴² Clearly, though, the function of the place was more flexible than simply existing as a shrine for that goddess. It is the location from which Šaggar and Šaššabêttu emerge on the 15th of SAG.MU in the sixth year of the *zuku* festival cycle.²⁴³ Emar 452 shows that an *abû* is associated with the place, to which offerings are made (*not* to Adammatera) on the twenty-fifth and twenty-seventh days of the month of Abû.²⁴⁴ And the *maš'artu* installation text calls for certain ritual items including a bed, chair, and censor, to be returned to this location, apparently after their use was completed.²⁴⁵ Thus the *bīt dug-li* is seen to function as a shrine to Adammatera, a ritual space for other deities, a storehouse for ritual wares, and a bank for payments to at least one cultic functionary. By embodying all of these roles, at once, the *bīt dug-li*, in fact, appears quite similar to the Temple of the Gods.

The similarity in their functions and especially the replacement of Emar 369B/C's "Temple of the Gods" with 369A's "*bīt dug-li*" could be taken to suggest that the names are alternate designations of the same place.²⁴⁶ Several texts, including Emar 373+, mention both names. If the places were, in fact, one and the same, then the variation in its name must be free alternation, since there is no obvious system dictating the choice of title. Since the proper reading of *dug-li* and, correspondingly, its meaning are unclear in

²⁴² Emar 369:33. Cf. Fleming, *Installation*, 114-16.

²⁴³ Emar 373+:178). Unless additional instructions concerning the placement of these deities in the *bīt dug-li* stood in the now-broken text of column III, no indication was previously given as to when or why they were there in the first place.

²⁴⁴ Emar 452:32, 52. Though many of the *abî* that receive offerings in this text are associated with temples, an *abî* of at least one non-cultic location—the palace—is also mentioned in this text (line 39).²⁴⁴ This hinders any attempt to interpret the *bīt dug-li* as a temple, based on this text.

²⁴⁵ Emar 370:79-80.

²⁴⁶ Fleming suggests something similar when he states, "At least as sources of allotments for personnel, the two places seem to be equivalent" (*Installation*, 114). He seems to mean only functional equivalence rather than actual correspondence.

the Emar texts, how such a designation would correspond to a “Temple (*bīt*) of the Gods” cannot be ascertained.²⁴⁷

The deficit in our knowledge about the Temple of the Gods from the ritual texts is compounded by its complete lack of attestation in the non-ritual documents from Emar. Its position in relation to the king and the city administration in ritual provisions implies that the Temple is an institution of some importance, making its absence from the quotidian texts surprising. It seems that the Temple of the Gods was focused solely on support of the Emarite cultic institutions and therefore was simply not relevant in the other, non-cultic records of the city—at least by that name.²⁴⁸

²⁴⁷ Fleming’s suggestion that the location of the *bīt dug-li* was within the temple of ^dNIN.URTA is unlikely. His conclusion is based on the reading of Emar 373:178 that he shares with Arnaud: ^dŠa-ag-ga-ar [...i-n]a É ^dNIN.URTA i-na É *tùk-li / ú-še-šu-ú*, “they bring out Šaggar [...] from ^dNIN.URTA’s temple, from the House of Assistance.” He suggests that the “House of Assistance” was the name of a specific room and, as such, is associated with the administrative activities of the ^dNIN.URTA institution (Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 42). The conclusion, however, is based on an insecure restoration of the broken text. The only times that the temple of ^dNIN.URTA is mentioned in Emar 373+ is to designate the deity who is called “Šaššabêttu of the temple of ^dNIN.URTA” (lines 25, 45). The relevant lines should read instead: ^dŠa-ag-ga-ar [ù Ša-aš-ša-be-tu₄ š]a É ^dNIN.URTA i-na É *dug-li / ú-še-šu-ú*, “They will bring out Šaggar [and Šaššabêttu o]f the Temple of ^dNIN.URTA from the *bīt dug-li*.” What the previous editors took to be a partial NA for the preposition “[in]a” should rather be read as a partial ŠA-sign, in front of which the DN Šaššabêttu fills the space of the break nicely. This reading—unfortunately, considering the dearth of information about the location in question—eliminates the notion that the *bīt dug-li* is somehow associated with the temple of ^dNIN.URTA.

²⁴⁸ Fleming has noted the similarity of the name “Temple of the Gods” with the official title “Diviner of the Gods of Emar,” held by a succession of individuals who seem to have been in charge of the cultic affairs of the city, as a whole. Since the archives of the building M1, which contained all of the ritual literature as well as over ninety percent of the Emar documents, overall, is closely associated with the Diviner of the Gods of Emar, it stands to reason, Fleming claims, that the M1 building is, itself, the Temple of the Gods (*Time at Emar*, 35-38). But titles such as “Temple of the Gods” and “Diviner of the Gods of Emar” are too generic to suggest a necessary connection to one another. To utilize a hypothetical that Fleming proposes: if a “Diviner of Dagan” were invoked in the texts it would be natural to suppose that he would be connected to Dagan’s temple. But the key to that example is the specificity that the proper name “Dagan” lends to the title. The blanket designation of “the gods” obscures our ability to understand whether the title should be associated with a specific conception of a corporate entity of deities or simply taken as a general reference to the divine population, at large. Moreover, the idea that Building M1 was a temple, at all, has been seriously called into question, though the issue remains divided. What is clear is that, were it truly a temple, it was also much more than that. Cf. Thomas McClellan, “Houses and Household in North Syria During the Late Bronze Age,” 30. For the suggestion that the building came to serve as the hub of local scribal education, see Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 54-55. For the suggestion that the building was a private residence that also served as a storehouse of public records, see Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 319. For criticism of Rutz’s interpretation of the building, cf. Daniel Fleming, review of Yoram Cohen, *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age* and Matthew Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge in*

Whatever else it was, the Temple of the Gods does seem to have been a proper temple—that is, not some other institution that could be described as a “divine house.” That much is suggested by the progressive feasting of the *maš’artu* installation festival, which occurs in a different temple location for each of six days. After dining in the temples of Dagan, ^dIŠKUR, and ^dNIN.URTA, the fourth day’s feast is located in the Temple of the Gods, which suggests that the institution is an analogous location to those single-deity temples.²⁴⁹ We are left to conclude that the Temple of the Gods represents some type of centralized sacred space dedicated to the gods, in general—to be sure, a concept that is ill-attested in ancient Near Eastern religious literature. But perhaps we should not imagine a Roman-style pantheon, permanently dedicated to all the gods together, but instead a common space in which any individual deity may be approached and venerated. If, in fact, the Temple of the Gods can be seen as equivalent to the *bīt dug-li*, then such an interpretation might explain why deities known to reside elsewhere, such as Šaššabêttu of ^dNIN.URTA’s temple, are found emerging from the space at prescribed times in the *zukru* festival. As a sacred space common to the gods, this building could be a location appropriate for the ritual activities of any deity.

The City is not a common purveyor of goods in other ritual texts.²⁵⁰ The more ancient ritual calendar, Emar 446, resembles the *zukru* festival’s role for the City in

Ancient Mesopotamia: The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and Their Tablet Collection, JAOS (forthcoming).

²⁴⁹ For this and other examples of collective worship, see Fleming, *Time at Emar* 37-38.

²⁵⁰ It is possible, though not clear, that the City is intended as a source of animal offerings in Emar 375A:33, which refers (in broken context) to “a lamb of the City” (UDU SILA₄ ša URU.KI). In the calendrical rituals that have provided the closest comparison to Emar 373 for the sourcing of offerings from the king and the Temple of the Gods (Emar 452, 463), the City maintains a much less visible presence. Offerings of sheep in those texts that we might expect to derive from the City instead are sourced from the *nupuhannū*. The sole reference to the city mentions only the act of “filling goblets provided by (ša) the City.”

restricting its offerings only to ovines, though with only three occasions upon which the city donates a single lamb, the scope of involvement is a bit more narrow.²⁵¹ None of those donations occurs in the first month of the six-month text, when the rites that prefigure the *zukru* ritual would have been celebrated.²⁵² The scope of the City's contributions is somewhat expanded in the *maš'artu* installation (Emar 370) where it provides two pure lambs—an offering type that fits comfortably with Emar 373+ and 446—but, in addition, two “strong oxen” and two goats for two sacrificial events.²⁵³ What all of these offerings have in common is their animalian nature. For ritual purposes, the City was a broker of domestic animals, perhaps as derived from city-owned pasture-lands.²⁵⁴

These benefactors of ritual activity in the calendrical texts are best understood against the backdrop of the well-attested governing institutions of Emar known primarily from the legal texts. Three branches of governmental authority appear in those texts, corresponding conceptually, if not in exact terminology, to the three arms of funding in the *zukru* festival and the other calendrical rituals: the king, the City, and ^dNIN.URTA.²⁵⁵

²⁵¹ Emar 446:80, 100, 104.

²⁵² In one additional instance, the City is actually the *recipient* of a sheep from the *nupuhannū*, alongside the temple of Dagan and the *abī* of the Temple of the Gods (446:80).

²⁵³ Emar 370:48, 51.

²⁵⁴ In this respect, Jacob Lauinger has called my attention to AIT 456:1, which associates the city of Imar with pastoralism (*Imar qadum nawēšu*).

²⁵⁵ In the standard format of Conventional land-sale contracts, the selling party is identified as ^dNIN.URTA and the “Elders of the city of Emar,” but the penalty fees for legal claims are routed to ^dNIN.URTA and “the City.” Certainly, then, the Elders are representatives of the institution known more broadly as “the City.” So Fleming, “A Limited Kingship,” 65 n.42. This is supported by the existence of aberrations in the formula that actually identify the owners of the property-for-sale as “^dNIN.URTA and the city of Emar” (cf. AuOrS1 19, *ASJ* 12 2, Emar 153). These aberrations may, in fact, reflect more clearly the actual ownership of properties conveyed in all or most of the Emar land-sale contracts. Although the issue remains an open question, Lena Fijałkowska has most recently concluded, “Les biens en question seraient donc la propriété de la municipalité, et Ninurta est mentionné dans les contrats en tant que dieu principal de la ville d’Emar.” See also her helpful summary of competing interpretations [*Le droit de la vente à Emar* (Philippika 64; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2014), 185-87; 193]. The City is also referenced with some frequency as the owner of properties adjacent to a property-for-sale in the definition of boundaries in a sale contract, underscoring its position as land-owner in the region. There are two documents that appear to distinguish

In legal texts, especially those which record the sale of city lands, a monarch, a city collective, and a representation of divinity control the distribution of property and benefit from the cost of sale as well as from any future legal claims on the land. From land-sale, alone, these institutions control wealth, some of which could conceivably be funneled into cultic maintenance. While there is no easy way to equate the Temple of the Gods in the ritual texts with (the institution of) ^dNIN.URTA in the legal texts, the existence of the same tripartite division of king, collective, and divinity as controllers of wealth in both reveals a continuity between them that must be more fully appreciated.²⁵⁶ It is likely that the public institutions known so well from the Conventional Format legal documents (or some similar or connected manifestations of them) are represented as being responsible for the financial provisioning of the *zukru* festival. This likelihood raises important questions about the historical and chronological context of the festival text and also about the ability of the named institutions to afford their respective financial obligations. These issues are addressed in depth in the following chapters.

The nupuḫannū-men

There are two additional groups of people mentioned in the text whose role in the event is much less clear. The first of these, the *nupuḫannū-men*, might fit somehow into the funding scheme of the festival, though our understanding of its involvement is severely limited by textual lacunae. It is only with the addition of the fragment originally

the two bodies more sharply, listing both “the City of Emar *and* the Elders of the City of Emar” as the parties responsible for the conveyance of property (RE 22:9; AuOr 5 3:8-9), though it is likely that these only “designate the elders as representatives of the city and need not be presenting them as separate legal entities” (Fleming, “A Limited Kingship,” 65 n.42).

²⁵⁶ Could it perhaps be the case that the funds obtained by ^dNIN.URTA in the land sales were for the benefit of the Temple of the Gods rather than the actual temple of ^dNIN.URTA?

published as Emar 374 to the main *zukru* festival text that the participation of this group is revealed. They are mentioned after a feast at the location of the *sikkānu*-stones, following the unction of the stones. Some broken instructions are given for “the return,” where we encounter the phrase “ša LÚ^{mes} *nu-pu-ḥa-nu*,” which could indicate either the designation of some property belonging to the group or, as is more frequently the case in this text, the citation of the group as a source of some ritual goods. But even if the text were more fully preserved at this point it is more than likely that no information regarding the *nuppuḥannū* would be enumerated outside of their designation as a source of sacrificial sheep, corresponding to the majority of the twenty attestations²⁵⁷ of this group elsewhere.²⁵⁸

On the basis of their frequent role as purveyors of sheep, Fleming has identified the group as a class of shepherds, speculating that their name, apparently derived from the verb *napāḥu* [D-stem, “to kindle (fire)”], could be based on association with the fires they burnt to facilitate their nighttime sojourns outside of the settlement.²⁵⁹ But there is no basis for associating the *nuppuḥannū* with sheep or shepherding any more closely than any other institution that furnishes sheep for sacrificial provision, such as the City or the Palace. What seems to be a close association with sheep is more likely an illusion created

²⁵⁷ All of the attestations are in ritual texts, with the possible exception of Emar 332:15, the genre of which is uncertain. The text contains an accounting of sheep for some specific occasion, which may well be a ritual event.

²⁵⁸ Emar 332:15; 374:12; 379:14; 422:6; 423:3; 446:9, 14, 60, 78, 81, 91; 450:1; 452:4, 17, 29, 32, 36, 54; 458:6; 463:12. Some examples, though too fragmentary to understand fully, suggest a role for the *nuppuḥannū* that extends beyond provision of goods (e.g. Emar 379, 450). An exceptional reference comes in Emar 446:48, where it seems that a sheep is slaughtered (*ṭabāhu*) for the *nuppuḥannū*, alongside offerings to “the garden of ^dIŠKUR’s pool” and Dagan Lord of Seed. This case is less than clear, though, since the text reads “1 UDU *i-na* ^l*nu-pu-ha-an-ni*,” where offerings provided “to” a party in this text are otherwise designated with the preposition *ana*.

²⁵⁹ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 151 n. 34.

by our lack of knowledge about the group's other activities.²⁶⁰ At any rate, the sourcing of non-ovine offering materials is attested at least twice (Emar 446:31, 78) and several texts seem to evidence a role for the *nupuhannū* in rituals that is not limited to the provision of sheep, even if these are too broken or ill-understood to provide a better context (e.g. Emar 450:1).

An etymological exploration of *nupuhannū* would highlight the known agential usages of the Semitic root **nph*. In Akkadian, as well as in a number of West Semitic languages, derivations of the root are used to designate activities and implements associated with smelting and smithery.²⁶¹ If the term in question does have a relation to the work of the smiths, the form is anomalous; standard Akkadian employs the *nomen professionis* pattern *nappāhu* for this designation.²⁶² Although there is no syllabic attestation of the word for “smith” in the Emar texts, it is unlikely that *nupuhannū* is simply a local pronunciation of the logogram ^{lú}SIMUG at Emar. The syllabic spellings ^{lú.meš}*na-pa-hu* at MB Alalah (AIT 47:6²⁶³) and *na-pa-hu* at nearby Ekalte (MBQ-T 81:16) reflect the expected Akkadian vocalization of the word. Instead, the most we can say is that the term might connote a group that has some connection to smith-craft.

That individuals associated with smithery might be designated as donors of ritual goods is feasible for reasons other than the etymology of the appellative. Smiths, denoted

²⁶⁰ The apparent offering of a sheep to the group in Emar 446:48 need not be taken as evidence for its special association with sheep, as apportionment of ritual offerings to non-divine individuals or groups is an altogether common feature of Emar ritual.

²⁶¹ Cf. BH *nōpēh* “smith” (Isa 54:16); Ug. *mph* “bellows” (KTU³ 1.4 I 23).

²⁶² Although the *u::u* vowel theme could suggest a D-stem verbal noun, *purrus*, that pattern is not used for agential nouns. Cf. Penttuc, *West Semitic Vocabulary*, 136; Fox, *Semitic Noun Patterns*, 422-23. More likely, if the idea of smithery is at stake, the noun is based on the G-stem of the root, perhaps in a *purus* or *purūs* pattern.

²⁶³ See Christian Niedorf, *Die mittelbabylonischen Rechtsurkunden aus Alalah (Schicht IV)* (AOAT 352; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008), 111, 361-66.

by the logogram ^{lú}SIMUG, appear to have been a wealthy and respected group at Emar. Two individuals are given the designation DUMU SIMUG in seal impression legends (AuOrS1 32:14, 16), which is likely to denote membership in a professional guild.²⁶⁴ It is not uncommon for a smith to be entitled as such when his name is mentioned in textual records, which may be an indication of prestige (Emar 3:17; *SMEA* 30 3:6). Moreover, based on references to individual smiths' land holdings and payments in precious metals, a degree of financial prosperity can be presumed.²⁶⁵

Notably, the smith is a known entity in Emar ritual. Nowhere is this clearer than in the ritual apportionments in the rites for Aštartu of Combat (Emar 460), where the Smith of the City (^{lú}SIMUG *ša* URU.KI) is a recipient in the company of the Diviner (^{lú}HAL), the goddess ^dNIN-É.GAL, and the Overseer of the Land (^{lú}UGULA.KALAM.MA). The smiths are also mentioned in the offering list Emar 378:38 in association with their patron god (H)ayya (Ea). So, while the evidence is insufficient to support a direct equation of the ^{lú}SIMUG^{meš} to the *nupuhannū*, the former shows that the latter—if they are indeed associated with smithery—may be in a position of wealth and prominence to play a role in ritual provisioning. The reasons for the group's financial sponsorship of city rituals is not clear; perhaps it is simply based on its position as a local organization with the means to provide support.

²⁶⁴ A similar title is given to an individual in RE 80:3, though a following, unreadable sign makes its interpretation less certain.

²⁶⁵ Cf. CM 13 18:7; Emar 3:17.

The zirāti-men

Quite the opposite of being a part of the festival's funding apparatus, the final entity mentioned in the text is rather a recipient of goods. This group of seven men called the “*zirāti*-men (LÚ^{meš} *zi-ir-a-ti*) of the Palace” is referenced only once, when they are provided with seven sheep from among seventy pure lambs that have been restrained. The *zirāti*-men are not the recipients of offerings; this would have been designated verbally with SISKUR = *naqû*. Instead, they are “given” (SUM = *nadānu*) the animals as a trust for offering to their gods, which is made clear by Emar 378:42 with its entry for the “gods of the seven *zirāti*-men” (DINGIR^{meš} *ša 7 LÚ^{meš} zi-ir-a-ti*). This role casts them as cultic functionaries, even if that is not their primary vocation, perhaps associated specifically with the palace cult.²⁶⁶

The most striking feature of this group is its name. Zerātu/Zarātu is otherwise known as the designation of the first calendar month in the Conventional Format documents, which was replaced by SAG.MU in Free Format texts.²⁶⁷ That month name probably derives from the root **ḏr* ‘“to sow,”’ which also yields the Akkadian substantive *zēru* “seed,” and lends an apt name for the early autumn month during which sowing would, in fact, have taken place.²⁶⁸ That understanding is underlined in the title of the men under discussion by the broken orthography *VC-V*, which probably indicates a III-

²⁶⁶ So Jordi Vidal Palomino, “El Rey de Emar en la fiesta zukru” in *De la estepa al Mediterráneo: actas del Ier Congreso de Arqueología e Historia Antigua del Oriente Próximo, Barcelona, 3-5 de Abril de 2000* (Barcelona: Eridu, 2001): 106. In this light, it is worth noting that seven deities in the hierarchical god-list can be associated with a palace cult (not including The Lord of Rabbâ, who is less likely to have been directly associated with the palace, despite his connection and importance to the royal family), making it possible that these seven men could be attendants for those deities. If so, Emar 378 would be repetitious when it enumerates those palace deities *as well as* the “seven gods of the LÚ^{meš} *zi-ir-a-ti*.”

²⁶⁷ E.g. Emar 447:6; *ASJ* 13 33:16; *AurOrS* 1 18:30. Cf. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 198, 200.

²⁶⁸ The Gezer Calendar from Palestine contains an equivalent designation for its first month, describing it by means of the accompanying task of “sowing.”

guttural noun.²⁶⁹ These individuals are “men of seed” or perhaps “of sowing”—that is, agriculturalists.²⁷⁰ But, since the grammatical form of *zirāti* is not attested outside of the month name, it is not impossible that the title of these men makes a connection to that temporal marker: “the men of the month of Zēratu.” The effect would be the same since that month name designates sowing and so would likely still tie these persons to that act, as well, but the designation would be understood as defining them by the ritual time in which they work, rather than the action.

The link between this group of “*zirāti*-men” and the traditional name of the first calendar month is a testament to the continuity of the *zukru* ritual’s fundamental purpose from the older form to the innovative festival version. Although the explicit connection of the ritual to “sowing” through the designation of the month name has been lost in the festival version, this designation maintains the traditional terminology of sowing that highlights what is at stake in the ritual performance.

Although neither their precise role vis-à-vis the palace and agriculture nor the identity of their gods can be determined, the fact that human actors related to local

²⁶⁹ See Penttuc, *West Semitic Vocabulary*, 195. Since the noun *zēru* (like its West Semitic cognates) is often used metaphorically to designate the “seed” of humans and, by extension, the progeny it produces, Penttuc and Fleming, in his earliest work on Emar ritual, suggested the term designates a group of royal offspring: princes (Penttuc, *West Semitic Vocabulary*, 195; Fleming, *Installation*, 236. Note that Fleming’s understanding evolved through his later work; cf. *Time at Emar*, 169 n. 135). This understanding is unlikely. As the idealized number of members—seven—shows, the group is a symbolically fixed body that is, furthermore, associated with a discrete set of gods (Emar 378:42). Such an institution could not be dependent on the actual number of male sons of the royal family, but should rather be seen as a permanent office. Additionally, it is unclear why the locution “men of the seed (= offspring)” should be employed to designate a prince, which is commonly denoted as “DUMU LUGAL” in Emar documentation (e.g. Emar 137:5, 15).

²⁷⁰ So Fleming, “A Limited Kingship,” 62 n. 22; idem., *Time at Emar*, 59–60 n. 31; Yamada, “The *zukru* Festival in Emar,” 126 n. 29. The grammatical form of *zirāti* is problematic since a feminine form of the noun *zēru* is otherwise unknown. The feminine ending likewise rules out an infinitival form (“sowing”) and makes a participle [i.e. “sower(s)”) impossible given the determination of the group as masculine (LÜ^{meš}). So an understanding of the title on the basis of the root **ḏr*’ can only depend on an otherwise unattested, feminine noun.

agrarian pursuits are included here is fitting for the overall agricultural setting of the festival. Perhaps these men, who were cultic actors insofar as they personally purveyed offerings to their gods, were responsible for the management of royal farmlands.

The Provisioning of the zukru Festival

It has already become clear that the *zukru* festival distinguished itself by the abundance of its sacrificial provisions. But the supplies of the festival stand out in more than just quantity. On the one hand, the *zukru* festival's inventory seems to call for high quality goods, especially concerning sacrificial animals. The *zukru* places an emphasis on the pure quality of the animals and some types of animals offered in this festival are never used in other Emarite rituals. On the other hand, the *zukru* festival also utilizes types of vessels and food offerings that do not align with what is common in the rest of the ritual corpus. Items such as *naptanu*-bread, *zadu*- and *hukku*-vessels and other goods that are ubiquitous in the installation rituals, *kissu* festivals, and other rites are nowhere to be found in the *zukru*. On the contrary, the *zukru* festival utilizes a supply of many goods that are not otherwise attested in the Emar rituals. These details reveal much about both the character of the *zukru* festival and the sources of its scheme of provision.

Animal Offerings: Prestige in Quantity and Quality

Some animal offerings in the *zukru* festival are altogether common to Emarite ritual. Such is the case of sacrificial birds (MUŠEN^{hi.a}), which are mentioned just prior to the hierarchical god-list. It is the only reference to bird offerings in the *zukru* and reminds us that, as formulaic as the offerings and actions in the text appear, its broken state

conceals elements of the ritual still unknown to us.²⁷¹ The two-line section in which the birds are mentioned offers limited context. We can perceive only that they are provided by the king and they may be related to the performance of “the eight Glorification ceremonies” (*kubbadi*). Although birds are never mentioned as a component of the Glorification Ceremony in the *zukru* materials, a much longer list of Glorification offerings, including birds, is detailed in the calendar of rituals for the month of Abû.²⁷² It is likely that the section in question is a summary reference to provisions needed for the execution of all the Glorifications during the festival. This observation has two consequences: (1) it associates the king with the performance of Glorification ceremonies, which is otherwise unknown, and (2) it suggests, by logical inference, that a Glorification Ceremony is performed on each day of the seven-day *zukru* festival as well as on the preceding Consecration Day.

The largest category of festival donations is ovine offerings, which is also the most common type in the rest of Emarite ritual. These are designated in four terms: sheep (UDU), lambs (SILA₄), pure lambs (SILA₄ KÙ.GA), and ewes (UDU.U₈).²⁷³ But in fact,

²⁷¹ Birds are a common feature of the Emar rituals, where they are given as offerings in a variety of ritual contexts. Most frequently the non-descript designation “bird” (MUŠEN) is applied, though specification of types is also known: doves (TU.MUŠEN; e.g. Emar 452:6 and passim; about two-thirds of the doves mentioned in the ritual corpus are in this text), Hurrian(?) birds (MUŠEN *hur-ri*; e.g. Emar 452:35, 45), and water-birds (MUŠEN A.MEŠ; e.g. Emar 463:9) are attested in the corpus. Where accounting notes are given, birds are seen to be offered frequently in large groups: twenty-one in Emar 462:14; thirty-five in 466:6 and 388:9; twenty in 466:7, 498:2, and 514:4; seventy doves in 463:6. Whatever type of bird MUŠEN designates, it is clear that it is not simply a catch-all term for the specified types. Cf. Emar 388:9, which tallies both birds (MUŠEN) and doves (TU.MUŠEN), showing the two to be discrete categories. However, this need not suggest coherence of species offered under the rubric of MUŠEN across the texts.

²⁷² Emar 452:35, 45. The former is performed “at the gate of the tomb.” The latter is offered before the *abû* of Dagan’s temple

²⁷³ All ovine donations in the sixth-year preparatory rites are simply called “sheep.” A shift in terminology occurs along with the move to rites for year seven in line 39; there, the prescription is for “seventy pure lambs” (70 UDU.SILA₄^{meš} KÙ.GA). Following this, the seventh-year offerings that are enumerated, including those of the hierarchical god-list, receive SILA₄. All references to UDU after the dawn of the seventh year, with the exception of those designating UDU.U₈, are collectives (i.e. UDU^{bi.a}), referring to the ovine offering animals, generally. Cf. lines 66, 374:5, 176. The latter of these stands alongside the sole occurrence of GUD^{meš} in the text, which provides a similarly collective reference to the cattle herds. Line

three of these—UDU, SILA₄, and SILA₄ KÙ.GA—envision the same animal. The first hint of their equivalence occurs in line 40, where the *zirāti*-men of the palace are given “seven sheep” (UDU) *from among* the “seventy pure lambs” (UDU.SILA₄^{meš} KÙ.GA). It is not surprising that a “pure lamb” might be named under the broader category of “sheep,” but the interchange also works in the other direction. The 25th of Niqalu rites in Part I of the text prescribes only sheep (UDU) for sacrifices, but the same day in Part II refers to all these animals collectively as “pure lambs” (SILA₄^{meš} KÙ.GA), demonstrating that younger animals of a pure state were intended all along.²⁷⁴ Likewise, the final tally of sacrificial animals for the entire course of festival-related events counts only “SILA₄^{meš},” and “AMAR^{meš}”—a summation that surely includes the other ovine animals mentioned in the text.

The fact that the sacrificial lambs should be pure is not surprising, in itself—similar purity requirements adhere to animals in comparable sacrificial institutions, such as that of ancient Israel, which is known in some detail.²⁷⁵ But the specification of animal purity in the Emar ritual texts is somewhat rare, occurring only here and in the installation festival for the *maš’artu*-priestess.²⁷⁶ The purity of other entities is of occasional concern in the rituals—most frequently the case for people, referring to cultic

22, where a SILA₄ *e-l[u]* occurs, is an exception to the strict division in terminology for the sixth and seventh years. The SILA₄ there seems to refer back to the animal already designated as UDU in line 18. Given the facts that (1) the line is much longer than those surrounding it, with its text turning up the middle margin and extending to the top of the tablet, and (2) the complementary line 51, which also deals with the people’s feast, stops with the words “*ana nīšu*,” it seems that the latter portion of the line is a later addition, perhaps after the scribe had already shifted to designating the sheep as SILA₄ rather than UDU. Despite the starkness of the division in terminology for the two years, there is no perceptible system to the variation.

²⁷⁴ Cf. lines 17-33 with the corresponding section in line 182.

²⁷⁵ Among many works dedicated to the issue, see Naphtali Meshel, “Pure, Impure, Permitted, Prohibited: A Study of Classification Systems in P” in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible* (ed. Naphtali Meshel *et al.*; New York, London: T & T Clark, 2008), 32-42.

²⁷⁶ Emar 370:45, 51, 60, 63, 66, 77; always 1 UDU *e-lu*.

functionaries involved in the ritual,²⁷⁷ but also true of tables (for feasting)²⁷⁸ and bread.²⁷⁹

Some or all of the ovine offerings specified in other ritual texts could also be intended to be pure, but, since the *zukru* takes the exceptional step of making purity explicit and, moreover, mentions a specific time for the purification (*ullulu*) of the herds and flocks (line 176), it rather seems that purity is a special concern for this event. In this way, even its most mundane offering category distinguishes itself as exceptional among Emarite rituals.

Table 16. *Sacrificial Animals Provided for the Month of Niqalu, Year Six*

	Recipient	Calves	Sheep (King)	Sheep (City)
24 th of Niqalu				
	13 Tier 1 Gods		13	
25 th of Niqalu				
	Dagan	2	6	[1]
	^d NIN.URTA		2	1
	Šaššabêttu	1	6	1
	Palace Gods	1	10	
Actual Total		4	40	
Stated Total (ln 33)		4	40	

Table 17. *Sacrificial Animals Provided for the Month of SAG.MU, Year Seven*

	Recipient	Calves	Lambs (King)	Lambs (City)
14 th of SAG.MU				
	All 70 Gods		70	
	Dagan	1	1	
15 th of SAG.MU				
	Dagan	[]	[]	10
	^d NIN.URTA	[]	[]	2
	Šaššabêttu	[]	[]	2
	Palace Gods	[]	[]	
Actual Total		1 + [n]	85 + [n]	
Stated Total (ln 59)		12	[]	

²⁷⁷ Emar 371:15; 385:38; 399:5; 431:5; *ASJ* 14 49:18.

²⁷⁸ Emar 369: 82, 83 (Fleming, *Installation*, lines 80, 82).

²⁷⁹ Emar 387:23.

In contrast to the hundreds of lambs that are required for the performance of sacrifices to the gods, only three ewes are mentioned in the text, always in connection with the performance of a Glorification Ceremony (*kubbadu*). Each performance requires a single ewe, which seems to be wholly burnt for “all the gods.” The ewe, a prestigious animal, is a fitting offering for a ceremony whose very name bears connotations of glory, honor, and wealth. Ewes are included in two lists of prestige goods willed by a man to his wife as a *kubuddā’u*, “honoring gift(?)”.²⁸⁰ Similarly, the ewe appears in Emar’s copy of the wisdom text, *šimā milka*, as a symbol of honor and success: “For the day of your death nine rations they will count and place at your head. Among your possessions are ..., ewes, goats, robes—(these are) your own share, all the wealth and food and tribute.”²⁸¹ The cultural attitude of esteem for the ewe probably accounts for the rarity of its appearance in the ritual texts. Indeed, ewes are found in only one fragment outside of the *zukru* festival text, where a large number of them seem to be allocated to the temples of ^dNIN.URTA, Dagan, ^dIŠKUR, and ^dNIN.KUR, though the purpose of these allocations is not preserved.²⁸² The use of the ewe in the *zukru* festival is one of several offerings that make a bold statement about the expense and prestige of the event.

The offering of calves in the *zukru* would have made a similar impression on the festival participants. Both recorded versions of the *zukru* rituals involve the sacrifice of one or more calves (AMAR), which constitute the only bovine offerings in these texts.²⁸³

²⁸⁰ AuOrS1 22:12; CM 13 14:3.

²⁸¹ Emar 778:145-149.

²⁸² Emar 469:1, 2, 4. The occurrence of the term in Emar 425:2 is incorporated into the text of Emar 373 in the present edition. It also occurs in the fragment Emar 424:5, which is certain to belong to Emar 373, though cannot be placed in the text with any confidence.

²⁸³ Both texts utilize the term GUD^{bi.a} to refer to the calves summarily, but do not prescribe GUD as an animal for offering. The only possible exception is Emar 375A:27, which attests GUD without a plural

Mature male bovines (GUD) are a staple offering in virtually all of the other rituals in the Emarite corpus. The calf-offering, on the other hand, is almost exclusively a feature of *zukru* practice.²⁸⁴

Neither is the sacrifice of a calf a well-known feature in comparable sacrificial systems. In the ritual texts from Ugarit, bovine offerings are always *'alp*, an adult bull.²⁸⁵ So, too, in the ancient Israelite cult. The calf is also only a rare offering; bovine offerings are commonly adult bulls (*par*)²⁸⁶ or referred to vaguely as being “one from the herd” (*ben habbāqār*).²⁸⁷ However, the calf is specified as the sin-offering on the eighth day of the inauguration of the temple²⁸⁸ and, moreover, the book of Micah suggests a place for the yearling calf in the sacrificial system.²⁸⁹

The restricted use of the calf in rituals from Emar, as well as those of comparable ritual systems, points to the distinguished place of this offering in the cult, which was undoubtedly based on expense. Breeders of cattle may have expected little more than one calf per three cows²⁹⁰ and the expenditure of young cattle meant a diminished return on investment, when compared to an adult animal who could be used for work, dairy, and, at

determinative, but the following term UDU^{bi.a} suggests a collective understanding for this instance of GUD as well.

²⁸⁴ The sole non-*zukru* offering of a calf occurs in the calendrical ritual text Emar 463:21, in which case it is supplied by the City, while the king supplies only sheep.

²⁸⁵ The term *'alp* can be applied to a young bull, as is the case in KTU³ 1.86:1, which designates a “yearling bull” (*'alp . šnt*). But, as this example shows, one expects specification of age requirements when applicable—a feature never encountered among the listing of bulls for sacrifice. The mythological text KTU³ 1.10 iii 1-2 may be a case where *'alp* designates a calf in the phrase *arḥt . tld[] / 'alp(?)* “the cows bear a bull.” The reading is uncertain, however, and the context unclear.

²⁸⁶ E.g., Lev 4:3; 8:2; 16:3.

²⁸⁷ E.g., Lev. 1:3

²⁸⁸ Lev 9:2, 3, 8. See the comments of Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 572.

²⁸⁹ Cf. Micah 6:6: “Shall I come before [Yahweh] with burnt offerings—with calves a year old?”

²⁹⁰ JCS 21:64-66. See Hartmut Waetzoldt “Rind. A,” *RIA* 11 (2008): 377.

the very least, a greater yield of meat.²⁹¹ It is probably a related fact that calves are never mentioned in the non-ritual Emar documents; trade in animals of this age may have been an uncommon affair. All this serves to indicate that not only is the *zukru* festival's preference for calf-offering distinct, but it is also very likely an indicator of the event's lavishness.

Offerings of Foodstuff: Underlying Indications of Hittite Involvement

The rest of the donations to the gods in the festival includes various types of grain-based edibles and libations. Some, though not all, of these foodstuff offerings are unique to the *zukru*, but keeping with its characteristic distinctiveness, the festival tends to present even common offering materials in peculiar ways.

The most frequently attested cereal offering in the text is porridge bread (^{ninda}*pa-pa-sV*), which is provided by both the king and the Temple of the Gods, usually in the fixed amount²⁹² of one *seah* and one *qa*.²⁹³

²⁹¹ The extravagant nature of calf consumption is also indicated in the Hebrew Bible. A stall-fed calf is the meal of choice for King Saul when dining with the witch of En Dor (1 Sam 28:24). For the prophet Amos, dining on veal is part of a nexus of symbolism of the excesses of the wealthy (Amos 6:4).

²⁹² There are three situations in which quantities deviate: (1) the provision “for the people,” which demands only one (or one-half? of a) *seah* (lines 22, 32), (2) the offerings to ^dNIN.URTA, which need only one *qa* (lines 24, 53), and (3) the third tier of the hierarchical god-list, which need only one *qa* (line 113).

²⁹³ One cannot be sure of the actual value of the Emar measures of volume. One text from OB Mari (*RA* 78 46, no. 9) demonstrates the equation 10 *qû* (SÌLA) = 1 *seah* (BÁN). In Kassite Babylonia, the volume of a *seah* was quite variable, ranging from four to twelve *qû*, though a value of ten *qû* may also be a reasonable baseline since the stable-value GUR presumes 1 *seah* = 10 *qû* [cf. Marvin Powell, “Maße und Gewichte,” *RIA* 7 (1990): 498]. The volume of a *qû* (written QA in Emar rather than SÌLA, as in some cases in MB Alalah; cf. Donald Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (Occasional publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 2; London, British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953), 15. Wiseman refers especially to ALT 309, which is not published) was just shy of a liter—0.84 liter, in the reckoning of CAD for Babylonia—which renders an approximately 8.5 liter *seah* (≈ 2.25 gallons). CAD Q s.v. *qû*. For comparable measurements at MB Alalah, see Niedorf, *Die mittelbabylonischen Rechtsurkunden aus Alalah*, 23. To put these numbers in perspective, we might compare the annual barley allotment of the NIN.DINGIR-priestess (in a good year), given as thirty *parīšu*. 1 *parīšu* = 60 *qû*, which means that the offerings of one *qû* of barley in the *zukru* text amount to a quantity roughly appropriate for a single-meal portion, if the priestess ate three meals a day and consumed her entire ration within the year. Cf. also Theo van den Hout, “Maße und Gewichte. Bei den Hethitern,” *RIA* 7 (1990): 522-525.

The term *pappasu* refers to a porridge that can consist of any grain. Barley porridge is specified in some cases at Mari²⁹⁴ and perhaps also once in an Emar ritual fragment, though it is impossible to know whether that or any other specific cereal is intended in the *zukru*.²⁹⁵ *pappasu* is the most frequently offered substance in the *zukru* festival, making it something of a staple of the ritual's sacrificial system.

While the item is attested with some frequency elsewhere in the rituals, its mode of presentation in the *zukru* festival text is unique. Here, it is written with the determinative NINDA, indicating a prepared cereal, while every non-*zukru* occurrence of the word is determined with ZĪ, designating a flour. If the determination with NINDA is not a scribal idiosyncrasy, then the *zukru* festival is unique in prescribing the offering of prepared breads rather than raw cereals.²⁹⁶ The distinction calls to mind the ancient Israelite grain offering (*minḥa*), which can either be given raw, mixed with frankincense (Lev 2:1-3) or cooked (in an oven, Lev 2:4; on a griddle, vv. 5-6; in a pan, v. 7) and raises the suspicion that such a variety of grain offering practices could be at stake here.

Perhaps the most notable feature of *pappasu* in the Emar rituals is where it does *not* occur. None of the other *festivals* make use of this offering. The ancient six-month ritual calendar (Emar 446) knows nothing of it; nor does the shorter *zukru* complex (Emar 375+). Various other local rituals, such as the *ḥenpa* of Cattle, the *imištu* of the King, and the rites for Aštartu of Combat leave it out, as well. The abundant use of this offering

²⁹⁴ ARM 9 121 iii 37.

²⁹⁵ Cf. Emar 442:2. Since ^{ninda}ŠE, “barley bread,” accompanies *pappasu* in most of its occurrences, it may even be unlikely that the *pappasu* consists of barley, unless “barley bread” and “(barley-)porridge bread” are distinct enough to be separate offering materials.

²⁹⁶ Of course, it could also be the case that prepared breads are envisioned in all instances, with the non-*zukru* texts simply specifying the amount of dry goods needed prepare the loaves rather than referring to the loaves, themselves. That the scribe slipped in line 22, determining *pappasu* with ZĪ rather than NINDA, yet still continuing to use NINDA in the rest of the text might show that the use of NINDA is intentional and in opposition to the determinative that the scribe is more used to writing.

material in Emar ritual is clustered in the calendrical rituals, Emar 452 and 463²⁹⁷ and in the rites for the gods of Hatti.²⁹⁸ *pappasu* is a material known in Hittite rituals of the empire period, sometimes designated in the amount of “a handful” (BA.BA.ZA ŠA UP-*NI*) and used for making ‘thick bread.’²⁹⁹ This could point to the use of *pappasu* as a result of some Hittite influence on certain aspects of the local, Emarite cult.

In almost every case that porridge bread is offered, it is accompanied by the presentation of barley bread (NINDA.ŠE).³⁰⁰ The offering of barley as a prepared bread—like the case of *pappasu*, discussed above—is not the normal mode of barley donations in the Emar cult. Barley is an entirely common staple of ritual offerings, though almost always in the form of raw grain (ŠE), flour (ZÌ ŠE), or barley-beer (KAŠ ŠE). In fact, the only other instances in which barley bread is utilized are in the rites for the gods of Hatti.³⁰¹ Whether barley bread was a material peculiar to the Hittite cult is unclear—though barley is attested in Hittite cultic texts, it also takes the form of flour or raw grain in all of the instances known to me.³⁰² Even if such a material was never utilized in the Hittite cult, it seems that provision of the gods with barley bread was perceived as the appropriate mode of worship of the gods of Hatti by the Emarites. In any

²⁹⁷ Emar 452 utilizes the material ten times, while Emar 463 does so about seven times.

²⁹⁸ Emar 472 has the highest concentration of *pappasu* references, totaling twenty-nine. Emar 473 attests another eight. Most of the various other texts that contain the word are fragments that may well belong with one of the tablets already named. An exception is Emar 462, a list of offerings associated with named deities, which contains the second highest concentration of references: nineteen. With what ritual practice this list is associated is not known.

²⁹⁹ See CTH 463 B 10' [Birgit Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi: Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463* (StBoT 48, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006), 292]; KBo XVII 65 rev 52 [Gary Beckman, *Hittite Birth Rituals* (StBoT 29; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), 144-145].

³⁰⁰ Barley bread always occurs in the quantity of one *qa*, except for the instances in which it is given as provision for “all the gods” or “the people,” in which cases the amount is substantially increased to four *seah*.

³⁰¹ Emar 472: 31, 34, 35 and passim; 473: 4, 6, 8 and passim. Also the fragment Emar 485:2.

³⁰² E.g., CTH 429.1 vs. I 12; CTH 718 F iv 9; CTH 391.1 i 3; KBo XXV 106 8. Both the Sumerogram ŠE and Hittite *halki*- designate the barley offerings.

case, the use of this item in the *zukru* festival unavoidably connects its offering materials to forms of divine provisioning more at home to worship of the Hittite deities.

The cases of porridge bread and barley bread are enlightening in two ways. The first is the unusual preference of the *zukru* festival for offering these otherwise common cereals in prepared rather than raw forms. That distinction may not be without meaning. Claude Lévi-Strauss studied the significance of “the raw and the cooked” in his book of the same name and concluded that, in ritual practice, cooked materials tend to represent culture as opposed to nature, which is symbolized as raw.³⁰³ Cooking indicates human intervention in the natural order. It may also serve as a symbol of maturity—a “growing up” in terms of advancing beyond the state of nature. In this light, the prepared grains of Emar’s *zukru* festival appear as a celebration of culture—a likely symbolism in a festival that ritualizes the beginning of the agricultural season for the apparent purpose of beseeching bounty. Neither, as we shall see, is this the only symbol of superiority over nature in the festival.

The second important quality of these two offerings is their correlation with Hittite ritual goods or, at least, goods used in worship of the gods of Hatti at Emar. This crucial observation can be expanded to several other types of donated foodstuffs, as well. One such offering is the ‘thick loaf’—a versatile offering of prepared cereals that, nevertheless, appears only sporadically in the rituals. It is used in the *zukru* festival especially as a component of the Glorification Ceremony.³⁰⁴ The use of this type of

³⁰³ My thanks are to Kyle McCarter to pointing me toward this anthropological study.

³⁰⁴ The specified amount of “2 *tapal*” of thick loaves in these cases should be taken to indicate two individual loaves rather than “two pair,” since we have seen that phrase elsewhere in the text as a redundant designation of a single pair. The broken reference in lines 38-39 probably prescribes the offering of *pappāsu* flour as a component for making thick loaves. Such is the model of Emar 463, which prescribes ingredients for offering-breads rather than the breads, themselves (cf. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 253). The fewer-than-ten remaining cases in which thick loaves are used in rituals reveal no consistency to its

offering in Emarite ritual may well be an importation of Hittite cultic practices, where NINDA.KUR₄.RA = ^{ninda}harši is the most common prepared cereal offering.³⁰⁵ In Hittite procedures it is juxtaposed with NINDA.SIG “thin bread,” which is used in Hittite ritual less often and exists nowhere in Emarite ritual.³⁰⁶

The *kurkurru*-vessel is a case in which a slightly different type of Hittite influence may be at work.³⁰⁷ The vessel was a common one, known from Mesopotamia, but the writing of the vessel’s name as KUR₄.KUR₄ shows an affinity to the Hittite usage of the term, rather than the Mesopotamian, which favored the logogram ^{dug}NÍG.TA.KUR₄.³⁰⁸ The scribal convention could indicate that usage of this vessel-type was influenced by a Hittite cultic presence or even Hittite interference in the local cult. Failing that, it may still be the case that, even if such a vessel were already in use in Emar, the preferred orthography of KUR₄.KUR₄ came along with the Hittites.

This *kurkurru*-vessel is not unique to *zukru* offering materials, though it never appears in any of the other major, city-wide festivals and its occurrences elsewhere are

employment as offering material. On one additional occasion, it is offered in connection with a Glorification Ceremony—this time the Major Glorification (*kubbadu rabû*) rather than the Minor Glorification (*kubbadu şehru*) attested throughout the *zukru* text (cf. Emar 463:5). All of one hundred loaves are offered on that occasion, revealing a marked difference between the scale of this event and that of its minor counterpart which utilizes two.

³⁰⁵ Harry Hoffner, *Alimenta Hethaeorum; food production in Hittite Asia Minor* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1974), 200-201. For some examples of the extensive use of this offering-bread in Hittite ritual, cf. CTH 718, for which see now Gary Beckman, *The Babilili-Ritual from Hattusa* (MC 19; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2014); CTH 627, see Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival: Part One*; and the Ambazzi rituals, see Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi*.

³⁰⁶ Hoffner suggests that NINDA.SIG is unleavened, in contrast to NINDA.KUR₄.RA (*Alimenta Hethaeorum*, 203). Beckman cautions, however, that the evidence is insufficient to bear out that dichotomy (*Babilili-Ritual from Hattusa*, 64).

³⁰⁷ The *kurkurru* is a feature only of the Pattern 1 offering sequence and, as such, is only ever provided by the king in the *zukru* festival.

³⁰⁸ For the Sumerogram in Hittite texts, see, e.g., KBo 11.43 rev. vi 29'. Cf. Ferdinand Sommer and Hans Ehelolf, *Das hethitische Ritual des Papanikri von Komana* (BoSt 10; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1924), 57 (after CAD K s.v. *kurkurru* A b). Also, Mitsuo Nakamura, *Das hethitische nuntariyasha-Fest*, (Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 94; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2002), 183. More commonly in that text is the vessel ^{dug}KUR₄.KUR₄ GÚ GÍD.DA, “long-necked” *kurkurru* utilized.

few.³⁰⁹ The content of the container is wine, making it the only certain reference to libation offerings in the text.³¹⁰ Wine offerings are a staple of Emarite ritual, offered more commonly in vessels such as *hizzibu*, *maḥḥaru*, or *hubu*.³¹¹

There is a final item that exceeds all the rest in terms of demonstrating a connection to Hittite modes of ritual practice. It is a vessel, contents unspecified, called *huppar*, which is always spelled syllabically but never with an Akkadian nominal declension.³¹² This type of vessel is sure to be an importation from Hittite cultic practices,³¹³ where the use of a container by the same name (*hu-u-up-pár*) is well attested.³¹⁴ The Hittite *huppar* refers both to a unit of measurement and its corresponding physical vessel, which seems to have been fairly capacious.³¹⁵ It was commonly used for containing liquids, though its use to store bread is also known. On the basis of comparison to ritual scenes depicted in the Malatya reliefs, Heinrich Otten has suggested identifying the *huppar* as a wide, two-handled vessel into which a drink-offering is libated.³¹⁶ There is no evidence in the Emar rituals for such a use of the vessel; it frequently occurs in contexts where no liquid offering materials are specified.

³⁰⁹ It is only found in Emar 393:28 and the fragments Emar 410:3 and 486:6. The rest of the inventory of these texts, however, is not similar to that of Emar 373+.

³¹⁰ Six of the attestations in Emar 373 specify “*kurkurru* of wine,” while the remainder reference the vessel alone. Of the three non-*zukru* occurrences, two specify wine (GEŠTIN in Emar 486:6 and KAŠ.GEŠTIN in Emar 393:28).

³¹¹ Cf. Emar 369, which prescribes wine offerings in all of these.

³¹² In this text and elsewhere, only a single *huppar*-vessel is prescribed at a time. The source may be the king or the Temple of the Gods.

³¹³ Cf., e.g., KBo X 31 II 7'; IV 9'; CTH 463 A:18, B:12; KUB 33 67 I 7'; KBo 30 3 I 4'.

³¹⁴ The Hurrians also used a ritual vessel called *hubrušhi*, a form of which was borrowed into Akkadian as *hubūru* in OA and *huburtu* in OB and Mari. The Akkadian terms designate a “beer vat.” One text indicates a location called the *bīt hubūri* (“house of the beer vat”) within the temple of Aššur (AOB I 4:16), which implies a connection of the vessel to ritual practices in Mesopotamia, also.

³¹⁵ The perception of its size is based on what seems to be an equation with the *ḥarši*-vessel, a pithos, in KBo 20 16 + KBo 25 13 II 7'f.:10. See Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival: Part One*, 162 n. 34.

³¹⁶ Heinrich Otten, “Ein Bestattungsritual hethitischer Könige,” *ZA* 46 (1940): 215 n. 6.

The *huppar*-vessel is always a component of the Glorification Ceremony in the *zukru* text, though it is not present in descriptions of that rite in all other occasions. A *huppar* is not a part of the most common offering sequences for the major deities. Specifically, it occupies a consistent place in offerings to ^dNIN.URTA and to the three primary palace gods, Bēlet-ekalli, ^dUTU and ^d30 “of the Palace. In the former case, the god receives *pappāsu* and a *huppar* instead of the standard offering from the Temple of the Gods (*pappāsu*, barley bread, and a ḪA-vessel). In the latter, the *huppar*-vessel stands in place of the ḪA-vessel, which the other gods receive. Based on the frequent coincidence of absence of ḪA-vessels when *huppar*-vessels appear, one might assume that the two are functional equivalents. Even so, they are not mutually exclusive—the two items are offered together on occasions in this text and in others.³¹⁷

All of these donations of foodstuffs and their distinctive vessels suggest a connection with Hittite ritual sensibilities in terms of its materiality. Some of these are unique to the *zukru* festival version, while others appear elsewhere in Emarite ritual. The thrust of the observation is to show that local ritual at Emar did, in fact, experience some acculturation of Hittite forms under imperial rule. This is an altogether jarring conclusion, considering the opposite result of the study of *zukru* divinity, which reveals distinctly local pantheon. Emar 373+, therefore, represents a known Syrian ritual that worships local Emarite gods, but with a ritual materiality that is distinctly foreign. The reason for this unexpected arrangement will be explored in depth in Chapter 5.

³¹⁷ E.g. Emar 373:21; 452:3; 461:7.

The Performance of the zukru in its Festival Form

When the *zukru* festival is stripped down to its core ritual performances its coherence with the essential rites of the shorter *zukru* becomes clear. For that reason, much of the analytical discussion of ritual actions in Chapter 2 can be cross-applied here. Yet, because of the scale and scope of the septennial festival as compared with its shorter counterpart, even some of the rites that the versions have in common are significantly enough re-contextualized as to warrant a new analysis. Additionally, a number of ritual actions that are not known from the shorter *zukru* appear in the longer version. Not only do these rites suggest new implications for the ritual's interests, but they also interact with the rites we already know to change how we understand their significance in the ritual.

All the Gods on Parade: The Processional Rites

The divine processions in the *zukru* festival season are events whose description pervades both Parts I and II of the text, where they are used to orient the timing and placement of offerings and other ritual activities. In Part I, offerings to the primary festival gods are connected to processions. Special notation is given for the processional departure of the primary deities, yet in fact *all* of the city's gods are on parade during the *zukru* festival. The spectacle of this occasion cannot be overestimated. In an environment where access to gods was severely restricted—limited to specialized cultic personnel—the procession of even a single god would have been a major event in the religious life of the city. It is likely the only opportunity an ordinary citizen would have had to experience the embodied presence of the deity. Now, three times within the span of a single year, the

entire divine population has emerged and flooded the streets of Emar. It would have been truly a liminal experience: the city was ablaze with divinity in corporeal form; the boundaries of sacred space became fluid; the hierarchies that dictate access to the gods were leveled—all features that create a transformative experience for the festival celebrants.

The circuit of the divine processions led outside of the city and seem always to have included the same stops. The primary destination, like in the shorter *zukru*, was the place characterized by *sikkānu*-stones—now more specifically called a “Gate of *sikkānu*-Stones”—where the offerings and feasts were staged.³¹⁸ Although this location is also the site of the important rituals to follow, there is also a practical dimension to the choice of this extramural setting for the gathering: no location within the city is likely to have been equipped to accommodate a gathering of the entire citizenry as well as the whole cast of local deities.³¹⁹

Some comment regarding the mode of Dagan’s processional transportation is in order, since it is an element unique to the *zukru* and, importantly, unique to the festival form of the ritual. No vehicle is specified for the transportation of divine images when they embark on their processional journeys. Yet, when the time comes for Dagan to perambulate the *sikkānu*-stones, the text specifies that he rides in a wagon

³¹⁸ Emar 375+ never refers to a “Gate of *sikkānu*-stones,” like that which is attested in Emar 373+, so while it is most likely that the stones visited in each version are the same, we cannot rule out the possibility that Emar 375+ envisions a different location. Either way, the variation in terminology is telling: even if the same place is envisioned, the failure to designate it with a consistent proper name shows a disconnect between the versions where there is a reasonable expectation of agreement. The disconnect could be as slight as the idiosyncrasies of different authors, but could also indicate a temporal chasm between the versions, if they reflect the parlance of different eras.

³¹⁹ This observation was brought to my attention by Daniel Fleming (personal communication). The excavated areas of the tell have revealed no public space sufficient for such an event.

(^{gis}MAR.GÍD.DA), which he may have occupied for the entire procession. The wagon was a cultic item reserved only for Dagan, which the other gods would not have enjoyed.

The machine in question here undoubtedly would have been a finely crafted item. When wagons appear in the Emar documents, they occur in inventories or inheritance documents that count them in the company of cultic items, prestige goods, and human property. Even ordinary wagons thus seem to be valuable goods, which both helps to clarify the appropriateness of the use of one to transport the chief god and suggests that the vehicle might have been of ornate construction.

Wagons are not items typically associated with divinity in Akkadian documents, with Mari's Festival of Nergal's Wagon being a notable exception.³²⁰ On the other hand, the frequent specification of wheeled vehicles of several types is a common feature of Hittite ritual texts.³²¹ The most relevant of these for the *zukru* festival is the Hittite *tiyrait*,

³²⁰ More commonly wagons in Akkadian documents are used by caravaneers for long-distance transportation of goods or as cargo vessels for heavy loads. Cf. CAD E s.v. *eriququ*. Fleming made the connection to the Festival of Nergal's wagon, which occurred within the larger scope of Mari's Eštar-festival (*Time at Emar*, 104 n. 239). It seems not to be a constituent feature of the that festival but rather a distinct practice concurrent with the Eštar ceremonies (cf. ARM 12 273, 274, 275). At least one text (ARM 5 25) shows a concern for amending the date of the Wagon-festival, apparently due to its popular (and, from the perspective of the author of this text, inappropriate) incorporation into the Eštar-festival. Nowhere are the details of the ritual of Nergal's wagon clearly illustrated. It seems to have been a yearly ceremony in which some processional movement of Nergal's divine image took place. It stands to reason that Nergal was mounted in the wagon for this event, though this is never made explicit. It is clear that the event involved sacrificial offerings, which may have been directed to the wagon, itself (ARM 5 25:5-6, ZUR.ZUR.RI *ša* ^{gis}MAR.GÍD.DA *ša* ^dNE.IRI₁₁.GAL). If this is the case, the nature of the wagon may be less of a utilitarian vehicle than a foreshadow of the deified vehicles known in some Mesopotamian cults in the Iron Age. Cf. Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Pantheon of Uruk during the Neo-Babylonian Period* (CM 23; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 295 for the divine chariot and ritual offerings to it. A deified chariot is specifically associated with Šamaš in NB Sippar; see Stefan Sawadzki, *Garments of the Gods: Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar According to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive* (OBO 218; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2006), 175-76.

³²¹ ^{gis}GIGIR, the chariot, is the preferred transportation method of the king in ritual texts. During the regional travels of the *nuntarriyašha* festival, not only does the chariot provide transportation for the king, but its mounting and dismounting provide a ritual frame for the sacrificial homage the king offers to several deities along the way [KBo 13.214 (CTH 635.3) r. iv 1, 13. Cf. Nakamura, *Das hethitische nuntarriyasha-Fest*, 258]. The chariot is also specified as the vehicle in which the king leads the large-scale procession of the KILAM festival outside of the city gates; see Singer's map of KILAM processional order (*The Hittite KILAM Festival Part One*, 91). The strong ritual connection between the king and the chariot is nowhere glimpsed better than in the rites for the king's death. In these, the king maintains a posthumous role in the

“wagon,” often designated as ^{gis}MAR.GÍD.DA, which occupies its own place in the Hittite cult.³²² Its use there is versatile. It is deployed in the funerary rituals for the king to receive the deceased monarch.³²³ The late king, wrapped in linen, is laid upon the wagon and offerings of cereals, fruits, and nuts are placed with him. It seems that the wagon, in this instance, is used as both a mobile shrine for the deceased king and a practical means of transportation to his final resting place.

Ceremonial wagons are perhaps the primary focus of the ritual display envisioned in the KI.LAM festival procession.³²⁴ The wagons are led by the king and queen in their chariots and are followed by a troop of dancers. The oxen that pull the wagon are specially ornamented with golden trappings.³²⁵ The wagon is also the beneficiary of special performances and songs by the ritual functionaries on some occasions.³²⁶ Whether the wagon carried an object of veneration is never made clear in the text, though it is not impossible that a divine image could have ridden here. Wagons in the possession of a god

rituals by way of a statue of him which is carried about in the chariot [cf. Alexei Kassian, Andrej Korolëv†, and Andrej Sidel'tsev, *Hittite Funerary Ritual: šalliš waštaiš* (AOAT 288; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002). (1) Days 8-9 vs. ii 5, ii 15', i 20'', ii 8 // B ii 5, ii 12 (2) Day 10 C iv 4, B i [9], 11 // A (3) Days 12-14 i 7, i 37, i 61]. Another wheeled vehicle with a strong presence in the rituals is the *hulukanni*- “coach.” Like the chariot, it is the frequent transport of the royals. In KBo 19 128 i 3-4, both the chariot (^{gis}GIGIR) and coach (*hulukanni*-) are approved as transportation devices for the king, who apparently had the freedom to choose between them. The king may ride in the coach on some days of the *nuntarriyašha* festival, though on at least one occasion he must send it away to Hattuša while he rides on elsewhere in the chariot (KBo 11.43 vs. i 27; Nakamura, *Das hethitische nuntarriyasha-Fest*, 173-175). Such an example reinforces the notion that the type of vehicle utilized on each occasion is important to the proper performance of the ritual.

³²² According to Armas Salonen, ^{gis}MAR.GÍD.DA in Hittite could indicate a four-wheeled wagon, as is the case in Mesopotamian sources, but also a two-wheeled chariot, as would be the case for the storm god's ^{gis}MAR.GÍD.DA [Notes on Wagons and Chariots in Ancient Mesopotamia (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1950), 4].

³²³ Kassian et al., *Hittite Funerary Ritual*, Days 1-2 3 vs. 4; 4 iv 4', 12'.

³²⁴ The Hittite term *nanankalta*-, unique to the KI.LAM festival, accompanies the reference to ^{gis}MAR.GÍD.DA in each case, which may suggest a special, sacred(?) wagon.

³²⁵ KBo 22 4 iv 1-14. Cf. Singer, *KI.LAM Festival: Part One*, 60.

³²⁶ KBo 10 24 ii 22''-28''

are known already in Old Hittite rituals, where the storm god can be found associated with just such a vehicle.³²⁷

The Hittite rituals do not offer any single, exact parallel for the *zukru* festival's use of the wagon. But they reveal a ritual context that (1) frequently utilizes the same vehicle that is prescribed in the *zukru*, which is otherwise unknown in Emar ritual and (2) demonstrates the importance of the modes of transport for ritual practices and concern for specification of the proper type. This is not to say that Syro-Mesopotamian sources do not also at times indicate modes of transporting divine images—indeed divine vehicles are shown to occupy an exalted status in compositions as early as the Early Dynastic period.³²⁸ But, in the first place, the terminology for such vehicles never matches that which is found in Emar 373+, designating instead the likes of *narkabtu* (^{gi8}GIGIR, GÌRI.GUB), “chariot,” *ša šadādi*, “litter,” *māširu*-vehicle, or *nubalu*-chariot (^{gi8}GIGIR).³²⁹ Additionally, the consistency and frequency of these specifications in the administrative-style Hittite rituals provide a closer and more compelling parallel to what is presented in the *zukru* festival material. The addition of the wagon, which is absent in Emar 375+, into Emar 373+ appears to be yet another innovation in ritual style based on Hittite sensibilities.

With Dagan's completion of the perambulation rite, the procession, which has been paused at the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones, resumes for its return leg. The procedure that initiates the return is a rite of divine unification (or non-unification). Dagan takes steps either to ignore, acknowledge or unite with ^dNIN.URTA in an act that symbolizes

³²⁷ KBo 25 139+ r. 14, 15; KBo 27 25 r. 8, 9; KBo 8 74+ r. iii 16.

³²⁸ Pongratz-Lesiten, *ina šulmi īrub*, 193.

³²⁹ Pongratz-Lesiten, *ina šulmi īrub*, 193-195.

the relationship between the gods. This symbolic relationship develops over the entire course of the festival and its preparations.³³⁰ On the earliest preparatory day, SAG.MU 15 in year 6, Dagan proceeds to ^dNIN.URTA after the perambulation rite and allows ^dNIN.URTA to mount up in the wagon with him. Since there are no further instructions given concerning what to do with the two deities once they have been united, the text implies that it is the unification, itself, that is the essence of the rite. The event acknowledges the intimate connection between the high god of the region, the chief of the Middle Euphrates pantheon, Dagan, and the city-god of Emar, ^dNIN.URTA. It is a rite that connects the locality to a broader region—in practical terms, the inland Syrian territories beholden to Dagan, but, in a broader sense, the entire cosmos, insofar as Dagan is the god of the cosmos—yet also affirms Emar’s preferential place to the god within that region.

On the 15th of SAG.MU in year six, Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA united after the perambulation as a symbol of the normal, beneficial state of relations between the gods. But after this day, during the liminal period of the “*zukru* season,” this relationship was suspended. On the 25th of Niqalu, Dagan proceeded to ^dNIN.URTA after the perambulation rite, but the two did not unite in the wagon. On the Consecration Day of the festival, proper, there was no rapprochement between the deities, at all. It was not until the final day of the festival, the same day that Dagan’s face was finally and permanently revealed, that Dagan again went to ^dNIN.URTA and proceeded with the unification.³³¹ This action reaffirms the privileged association of ^dNIN.URTA with Dagan

³³⁰ This rite is not the only one with a multi-year development; so, too, the veiling rites of Dagan. See page 263-68.

³³¹ The mounting up of ^dNIN.URTA with Dagan on the final day of the festival is reconstructed (line 203-204) in part II of the text. However, it is present in line 164-65, which is likely to preserve instructions for

and represents a transition into a post-liminal phase, when the divine order and the special role of the city are confirmed.

Following the unification, the procession returns to the urban environment in a ritualized re-entry referred to in the text as *turtu* (the “return”). Although not described in detail, the action in question can be characterized as an entrance rite, designed to put the hierarchy of the gods on display—with Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA conspicuously joined at the lead—and to demonstrate hegemony over the city.

Though such ritual construction of power through entrance is known the world over, it is useful to recall some Bronze Age Syrian examples of the same phenomenon.³³² In Eblaite rituals for royal marriage and coronation, the royals set out on pilgrimages to regional centers, entering their cities and their temples to commune with the gods there. It is not until their power is displayed—that is, constructed—in those places that they may return to Ebla, enter the city and its temple and assume the full rights of royalty.³³³ Zimri-Lim’s long journey through the kingdom of Mari and then beyond may have also had such an impact.³³⁴ This is especially true for stops within his own territory, but even in foreign lands, his procession would have displayed his strength and influence. Neither would the impact of his foreign travels be lost on the citizens of Mari territory, who

the last day of the festival either belonging to part I or to another, now-lost section from the bottom of col. III. Either way, it suggests the unification rite would occur again on the last day.

³³² David Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 24.

³³³ ARET XI 1, 2. See Lauren Ristvet, “Travel and the Making of North Mesopotamian Polities,” *BASOR* 361 (2011): 10-11. Also, Lauren Ristvet, *Ritual, Performance, and Politics in the Ancient Near East* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

³³⁴ See Jack Sasson, “Zimri-Lim Takes the Grand Tour,” *BA* 47/4 (1984): 246-51.

would have seen the far-flung travels of the king as an expansion of the ruler's own power and dominion.³³⁵

The description of the unification rite and the accompanying entrance rite already suggests its not-too-subtle political overtones as a joining of center and periphery. The primary object of worship is Dagan, the highest king, and it is only through his aegis that the local god, standing for the city, itself, maintains his favor and ability to share a degree of control over the city's governance. Such a symbol smacks of imperial ideology. It is no matter that the chief god of the festival is Syrian, rather than Hittite. It was not the custom of the Hittites to impose their own deities onto foreign religious systems; more often they adopted the foreign gods for themselves.³³⁶ Even so, an ideology of local dependence upon and cooperation with the higher authority is infused into the rite. The denial of the high authority's favor during the liminal phase of preparatory year, like all liminal phases, is a period of uncertainty, anxiety, and formlessness. It is only through the beneficent recognition of the highest power that a return to normalcy occurs. That these ideological—indeed, theological—concepts are expressed through processional activities is both appropriate to the ritual genre and expected. As Beate Pongratz-Leisten has observed of the *akītu*-festival processions in Assur, Babylon, and Uruk, “Prozession ist als optisches Medium zur Vermittlung von theologischer Information an das Volk geradezu prädestiniert,” which amounts to a “Popularisierung von Theologie” and the ideological program that underpins it.³³⁷

³³⁵ Cf. Mary Helms, *Ulysses Sail: An Ethnographic Odyssey of Power, Knowledge and Geographical Distance* (Princeton: University Press, 1988) after Ristvet, “Travel and the Making of North Mesopotamian Politics,” 1.

³³⁶ Cf. Trevor Bryce, *Life and Society in the Hittite World* (Oxford: University Press, 2002), 135-36, who describes the Hittites as “extreme polytheists.”

³³⁷ Pongratz-Leisten, *ina šulmi īrub*, 115.

Feasting and the New zukru Sponsorship

The *zukru* festival's four feasting occasions include two that are known already from the shorter *zukru* ritual and two additional meals facilitated by the addition of preparatory ritual events. Only on the twenty-fifth of Niqua (year 6) does the text issue an explicit directive to for "the people" to feast (line 22). But references to feasts on the 15th of SAG.MU of year 6 and the same date in year 7, as well as to the collection of uneaten goods on the 21st of SAG.MU, the final day of the festival, shows that almost every day whose events are covered in the text involves the hosting of a feast.

The temporal connection of the feasting rite with the anointing of the *sikkānu*-stones (lines 34, 60) suggests a location for the meal at the Gate of *sikkānu*-Stones. When feasting occurs in the installation of the NIN.DINGIR of ^dIŠKUR, it takes place either in ^dIŠKUR's temple or in the official residence of the priestess. For the *maš'artu* installation, most of the feasting activity is in the priestess's residence and during the *kissu* for Dagan feasts occur in Dagan's temple.³³⁸ The commonality among these is that the location of a feast in a particular ritual context is determined by the principal honoree(s) of the ritual complex. This, in turn, suggests that the Gate of *sikkānu*-Stones itself is the primary ritual location, associated with the ultimate target of the festival's veneration. The overall picture of the *zukru* depicts it as a celebration given to Dagan, which could suggest that the Gate of *sikkānu*-Stones was a place particularly associated with his worship, even dedicated to him as an extra-mural shrine.³³⁹ This would be

³³⁸ A notable exception in this ritual is the seven-day, progressive feast that takes place in the temple of a different god each day. The divine residences that are chosen do not reflect a special association with the festival, but rather acknowledge the institutions of the most important gods. Cf. Emar 370: esp. 45-65.

³³⁹ Recall that "the Emarites give the *zukru* festival...[to] Dagan Lord of the First Fruit" (lines 169-170).

reinforced by the *kissu* festival offerings to Dagan of the Valley at the same location.³⁴⁰

Dagan's position of authority in this location as the sole ritual actor accords with such a notion, though nothing in the text makes it explicit.

Like the shorter *zukru* text, the instructions relate nothing about the cuisine served at the feasting event, though it is likely that some portions of the sacrificial provisions would be consumed by the attendees. This is made especially clear by instructions to collect "all the meat (and) bread—whatever they should eat" during the processional return.³⁴¹ Since no such foodstuffs have been mentioned in the text outside of the sacrificial offerings, one can only assume these offerings have some place in the feasts.³⁴²

In the previous chapter the political implications of feasting activities were brought to bear on the interpretation of the *zukru* feasts. The host of the feast—in that case evidently the city authority—establishes a position of power over the guests by virtue of offering a gift that cannot be reciprocated. The power dynamics of feasting are especially important for assessing change in the forms of *zukru* practice since, in the festival version, the host of the feast is no longer the city but rather the king. The king, along with whatever financial backers supported his outlandish donations to the *zukru* festival, can be seen as asserting power in the *zukru* festival where he had none in the shorter *zukru* ritual. The insertion of the king's interest in the ritual is likely to have corresponded with a historical horizon in which the Emarite king's power increased substantially. That development will be taken up again in Chapter 4.

³⁴⁰ Emar 388:14.

³⁴¹ Emar 373+:199.

³⁴² The thrice-enumerated offering "for the people" does not seem to be actual provision for the people to feast since the designated amounts are too small to represent a meaningful portion for any sizable crowd. The offering might, instead, be a symbolic gift given *on behalf of* the people to the gods.

Veiling the Face of Dagan

One of the unique features presented in the action-oriented section of the text (Part II) is the concern for the visibility or non-visibility of the divine visage.

Descriptions of the state of coverage of Dagan's face occur in connection with the god's movements, either in procession or during the perambulation. In only one instance is another god described as being subject to veiling: on the 15th of SAG.MU (year 6) the face of ^dNIN.URTA is veiled together with that of Dagan upon their unification in the god's wagon.

The veiling requirement is related either as a description of the state of the god's face as "veiled" (*kuttumū*) or "unveiled" (*petū*) or as a fientive prescription for the ritual participants to "veil" (*ukattamū*) or "unveil" (*ipettū*) it. The veil, itself, is never mentioned. A certain *kutmu*-garment that is found in the possession of several deities in other cultic texts calls to mind the veiling rite by virtue of its verbal root, but whether the "veiling" function of this garment reaches beyond simple bodily coverage into the realm of facial obscurity cannot be determined.³⁴³

There is no comparable act of veiling divine statuary in the Emar ritual corpus.³⁴⁴ The same verbal form is used to describe the adornment of the NIN.DINGIR initiand, though in that case the object of the covering is the woman's head rather than her face. The text is explicit that she should be ornamented like a bride (*ki-i É.GI₄.A*), which

³⁴³ CM 13 24:14, 17, 18 (dedicatory inscription enumerating gifts to ^dNIN.URTA and three accompanying deities); 25:16 (inventory of the ornamentation of Aštartu-haši).

³⁴⁴ Two other ritual texts use the verb *kuttumu* to prescribe ritual covering of some kind, but both occur in broken and uncertain context. Emar 370:28 [...] / [i]š-tu TÚG^{hi.a} ú-kat-ta-mu, "They will cover [...] with garments; 388:32 [...] / TÚG ÍB.LÁ ú-kat-[ta-mu...], "They cover [...] with a belt."

shows the veil in this case to serve a well-defined social function that is distinct from the covering-garment in the *zukru*.³⁴⁵

Michel has explained the veiling of Dagan as a tactic by which to “avoid any bad omen during the procession of the deity.”³⁴⁶ The Babylonian “procession omens,” part of the omen series *šumma ālu*, provide a comperandum for such concern. These interpret potential aberrations in the physical state of the cult statue of Marduk—notably including changes in the hue of his face—near the time of procession for the New Year’s festival.³⁴⁷ But if the Emarites were concerned with this type of ominous observation, I doubt that covering the source of the omen (here, the god’s face) would satisfactorily deter the negative consequences that the omen would have predicted, had it been noted. Neither would it be effective to camouflage the ominous visage on the occasions when the facial covering is removed. Moreover, by the logic of the procession omens, the god’s face being “hidden” is, itself, a bad omen, for it indicates “daß die Gottheit nicht ihren lebensspendenden Blick auf das Land richten kann, weshalb sich dort Todesfälle ereignen..., die Leute dezimiert... bzw. die Länder zerstört werden und die Könige einander feindlich gegenüberstehen...”³⁴⁸

³⁴⁵ On the importance of veils for marriage customs and wedding traditions, see Karel van der Toorne, “The Significance of the Veil in the Ancient Near East” in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (ed. D. Wright, D.N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), esp. 330-331.

³⁴⁶ Patrick Michel, “Ritual in Emar” in *Approaching Rituals in Ancient Cultures. Questioni di rito: rituali come fonte di conoscenza delle religioni e delle concezioni del mondo nelle culture antiche*, Proceedings of the Conference, Rome, November 28-30, 2011 (ed. Claus Ambos and Lorenzo Verderame; Supplemento 2 alla Rivista Degli Studi Orientali N.S. 86; Pisa, Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2013), 191.

³⁴⁷ For the full text of the series and all known exemplars, see Pongratz-Lesiten, *ina šulmi īrub*, 257-65. A detailed interpretation of the omens is offered by Walther Sallaberger, “Das Erscheinen Marduks als Vorzeichen: Kultstatue und Neujahrsfest in der Omenserie *Šumma ālu*,” *ZA* 90 (2000): 227-262.

³⁴⁸ Sallaberger, “Das Erscheinen Marduks als Vorzeichen,” 250.

The veiling of Dagan's face has the effect of limiting the ability of the public to perceive the god fully. For Fleming, this is necessary to "mute" the god's radiance and as such seems to be an act of protection for the benefit of the viewers. Such is the concern of the god of Israel in prescribing degrees of screening and separation to mitigate the experience of his full glory.³⁴⁹ But, as with any protective measures, this has a restrictive aspect: the people's experience with the divine—an experience for which these processions may be the only occasion—is curtailed. Crowell emphasizes this limiting aspect:

While the masking of the divine image physically concealed the face from the public, the rituals would also maintain a political and social hierarchy: those admitted to the rituals among the *sikkānu* stelae were permitted to view the divine face, while the general public must wait until the final ceremony of the festival before viewing the face of the image. In this manner, the process of masking and unmasking a divine image can be viewed as a means of political and religious hierarchy maintenance.³⁵⁰

Crowell, however, overshoots the mark by superimposing a level of stratification in the festival's inclusiveness that is simply not reflected by the text. After all, the only named participants are "the Emarites," i.e. "the general public;" it is they who "give" the festival and there is no indication that any of them are excluded from any of its rites.

What plagues interpretations that point to the veil's limiting aspect, whether primarily protective or restrictive, is that not all of Dagan's processions are veiled. In addition to the unveiled return to the city on the seventh day of the festival, on the fifteenth of SAG.MU in the sixth year, Dagan's procession from the temple to the Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones is conducted without a veil. The unveiled processions show that the

³⁴⁹ For a recent discussion of the "face-to-face" experience with Yahweh see Simeon Chavel, "The Face of God and the Etiquette of Eye-Contact: Visitation, Pilgrimage, and Prophetic Vision in Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish Imagination," *JSQ* 19 (2012), 1-55.

³⁵⁰ Bradley Crowell, "The Development of Dagan: A Sketch," *JANER* 1 (2001): 62.

covering of Dagan's face is not essential: neither is his "full glory" harmful to the crowd nor is the crowd prohibited from viewing the face of the god on some occasions. The fact that the god's face can be exposed during processions and other rites suggests that veiling serves a symbolic rather than essential function. That such a symbolic pattern exists can be seen by examining the rite of veiling not as a practice specific to each enumerated day but as one that spans the entire course of the festival and all its preparatory events. The unveiled processions of Dagan occur only on the 15th of SAG.MU in the sixth year and the 21st of SAG.MU of the 7th year—that is, the very first day of preparatory rituals and the final day of the festival, itself. The exposure of Dagan's face in procession bookends the entire event and suggests that, once veiled, Dagan remains in a veiled state throughout the whole complex of ritual events. The only exception is his temporary unveiling at the *sikkānu*-stones on the fifteenth of SAG.MU in the seventh year before the perambulation, which provides a foil to his *veiling* before the perambulation on the same date in the sixth year. His permanent unveiling, however, does not occur until the end of the seventh day of the festival.

The festival-long duration of the veiling rite can also be detected through the verbal forms used to describe the activity. At the beginning of ritual events in the sixth year, Dagan's face is already in a state of being unveiled, which is expressed with the stative verb *petû*. It is during the events of this day that the ritual prescription is given to veil him, expressed with the finite verb *ukattamû*. That his face remains veiled is clear from his next appearance on the twenty-fifth of SAG.MU when he processes out with his face already in a state of being veiled, again expressed descriptively (*kuttumû*). The same pattern remains in effect until the fifteenth of SAG.MU in the seventh year, when his face

is visible (*apû*) only for the perambulation but then veiled again (*ukattamû*) after. Finally, on the last day of the festival, Dagan's face is unveiled (*ipettû*). This final description is the only time *petû* occurs in a finite form in the text and should be seen as a final reversal of the initial "veiling" (*ukattamû*) on the first day of preparatory rituals.

It therefore appears that Dagan remains veiled for the entire year leading up to the final ritual event. The act of veiling Dagan in the sixth year may even be the primary purpose of the preparatory rites of the fifteenth of SAG.MU: it inaugurates what might be described as a "*zukru* season" in the seven-year cycle.

In the shorter *zukru* ritual, the progression of the veiling rite is less certain owing to a lack of textual preservation. It is clear that, like in the festival version, Dagan goes out unveiled in his first procession on the 15th of the first month and is veiled that same day. But, because of the ambiguity in the cycle of the shorter *zukru* that I have already pointed out, it is unclear whether this veiling event should occur in a preparatory year like in the festival version, or if, in the case that the shorter *zukru* was annual, the entire veiling complex is fit into a single, seven-day period in the same year. No further references to the veiling/unveiling rites survive in that text.

Our limited knowledge of the Emarite symbolic system makes identifying the significance of the statue's veiling a matter of speculation, though it is possible to make a few remarks on the action in terms of its ritual function. As a case in which the deity participates in public performance in a state of facial obscurity, it is appropriate to view the feature in terms of ritual masking.³⁵¹ Ritual masks are perhaps especially known for

³⁵¹ Crowell has already identified masking as the correct rubric within which to discuss the veiling rite, though his treatment of the rite is not sensitive to the implications of it as a ritual phenomenon. His interpretation, instead, takes a functionalist stance on the rite's maintenance of the (human) social order ("Development of Dagan," 61-62).

the altered states they inflict upon their wearers, whether physiological (e.g. ecstasy) or social.³⁵² In the present case, the inanimate nature of the masked party (or at least of its representation, the divine statue) eliminates the experiential element on the side of the wearer and with it the most notable features of the mask's power. Nevertheless, concealment of the god's face would have the same effect on the *audience* that is noted in other masking events. The denial of the god's face would be an anxiety-inducing experience that marks a departure from the natural state and creates confusion about the deity's relationship to the city and its people. The action marks the abandonment of the known socio-religious structure and effects the participants' transition into a liminal state, which will last for the duration of the *zukru* preparatory rites over the course of an entire year.³⁵³ The revelation of Dagan's face during the festival, itself, represents a post-liminal movement, when Dagan returns to his normal state, perhaps reaffirming his role *vis-à-vis* the city and its pantheon.

Anointing the Stones with Blood and Oil

The act of anointing the *sikkānu*-stones with blood and oil was already discussed as a phenomenon in the previous chapter. Indeed, the act of unction is rare in the Emar ritual texts, occurring otherwise only in the NIN.DINGIR installation, where the initiand is anointed with fine oil at the moments of her selection (Emar 369:4) and consecration (line 21). In a parallel act, the new NIN.DINGIR, herself, anoints the upright stone of

³⁵² A benchmark study of masking can be found in Ronald Grimes, *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (3d edition; Waterloo: Ritual Studies International, 2013), 69-79. On the transformative power of mask, in particular, see Michael Merrill, "Masks, Metaphor and Transformation: The Communication of Belief in Ritual Performance" *JRitSt* 18 (2004): 16-33.

³⁵³ For the transformative nature of masking for the viewer, see Merrill, "Masks, Metaphor, and Transformation," 19-23. The transformative aspect of masking is also approached in Jon Mitchell, "Ritual Transformation and the Existential Grounds of Selfhood," *JRitSt* 23 (2009): 53-66.

Hebat. This latter could suggest a strong connection between the use of *sikkānu*-stones and the act of anointing.

But aside from the anointing of the *sikkānu*-stones, there is another instance in which unction probably takes place in the *zukru*, though the context is broken. This action occurs at the close of Part I, which likely describes the 21st of SAG.MU, the final day of the festival. Following the anointing of the *sikkānu*-stones, (a branch of) tamarisk is used to “smear [something] upon the gods.”³⁵⁴ This is the only occasion in the event when the gods, themselves, are anointed.

Although tamarisk is attested only once elsewhere in the ritual corpus of Emar,³⁵⁵ it is a much-used tool in rituals throughout the Near East and Anatolia.³⁵⁶ It is especially associated with rites of purification.³⁵⁷ The anointing of divine images is also a widely attested practice known from Egypt,³⁵⁸ Mesopotamia,³⁵⁹ and Anatolia,³⁶⁰ which is additionally found in the neighborhood of Emar at Mari³⁶¹ and (in a Hurrian text from) Ugarit.³⁶² In general, it is considered an act of care for the deity: cleaning, soothing, and providing pleasant aromas.³⁶³ But considering the use of tamarisk in the present case,

³⁵⁴ Emar 373+: 168.

³⁵⁵ Emar 370:86, where the new *maš’artu*-priestess is instructed to “bind tamarisk” (^{giš}SINIG *ta-ra-ak-ka-as*). No instrumental function is assigned to the bound tamarisk, leaving the reader to wonder whether the act of binding, itself, is ritually significant.

³⁵⁶ Cf. CAD B s.v. *bīnu* A b-2’.

³⁵⁷ This association may be related—in Mesopotamia, at least—to the belief that the exceptionally long roots of the tamarisk are connected to the waters of the *apsû*, imbuing it with its efficacious powers. Cf. Manfred Krebernik, “Die Beschwörungen aus Fara und Ebla. Untersuchungen zur ältesten keilschriftlichen Beschwörungsliteratur (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1984), 226; and, more recently, Michael Streck “Dattelpalme und Tamariske in Mesopotamien nach dem akkadischen Streitgespräch,” *ZA* 94 (2004): 282-283.

³⁵⁸ Dimitri Meeks and Christine Favard-Meeks, *La vie quotidienne des dieux égyptiens* (Paris: Hachette, 1993), 185–190.

³⁵⁹ M. Worthington, “Salbung,” *RIA* 11 (2008), 574-75.

³⁶⁰ Volkert Haas, *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica: Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 259-266.

³⁶¹ ARM 7 73:3.

³⁶² Joseph Lam, “A Reassessment of the Alphabetic Hurrian Text RS 1.004,” esp. 166-69.

³⁶³ So Lam, “A Reassessment of the Alphabetic Hurrian Text RS 1.004,” 166.

with its purificatory properties, and the concern for purification in the *zukru* text (cf. line 176), one wonders if a purification of the divine statues is rather intended here.³⁶⁴

The much more frequent act of anointing the *sikkānu*-stones is described with variant terminology in the festival text, being designated by two verbs: *pašāšu* and *terû*. The former is common in standard Akkadian for anointment in both sacred and mundane contexts; it can refer to the rubbing of substances (cleansing oil, medicinal salves, poisonous creams) onto the human body as well as to the anointing of divine statues and cultic furniture.³⁶⁵ The method of application is rubbing, perhaps especially with the hands.³⁶⁶

The verb *terû* on the other hand, is not typically used in expressions of unction. Its primary referent, according to CAD, is the action of pressing a substance to extract liquid from it. For the present case, this could suggest a procedure in which the anointing liquids are absorbed by a cloth or other carrier and squeezed out over the top of the stones. But such an interpretation is grammatically difficult here since the object of the “pressing” is the stones, rather than the anointing fluids.³⁶⁷

The nuance of the verb in this case may be closer to that proposed by von Soden: “einmassieren (Salbe).”³⁶⁸ In this case, there is no procedural difference denoted by the variation between *pašāšu* and *terû*. The action in all cases implies the rubbing of liquids

³⁶⁴ For purification of divine images, see Hundley, *Keeping Heaving on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly*, 126-130. Billie Jean Collins, *The Hittites and Their World* (Atlanta: SBL, 2007), 165. Gary Beckman, “Sacrifice, Offerings, and Votives: Anatolia” in *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide* (ed. Sarah Iles Johnston; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 338.

³⁶⁵ For the use of *pašāšu* in ritual contexts at Mari, cf. MARI 3 90 no. 43:5; no 44:2; ARM 7 6:2; 11:3.

³⁶⁶ Cf. Köcher BAM 494 ii 15.

³⁶⁷ The Arabic cognate *ṭaraḥa* attests the meaning “throw, fling,” which could indicate dashing of blood against the stones in a manner similar to the sprinkling of blood on the altar in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Exod 24:6 et al.). However, this interpretation too suffers from the grammatical difficulty of the stones’ place as direct object of the phrase.

³⁶⁸ AHW 3:1389, mng. 4.

directly onto the stones, perhaps with the hands or a cultic implement such as the tamarisk that seems to be used to anoint the divine statues.³⁶⁹ This stands in distinction to the practice of anointment in the NIN.DINGIR installation, where the oil is “poured” (*tabāku*) on the head of the anointed party.³⁷⁰ One explanation for this difference is that *Ī* in the *zukru* texts does not describe a liquid substance, but rather animal fat. This is made explicit in line 167 where the substance is described as *Ī.UDU*, “fat of the sheep”—that is, of the ewe (*UDU.U₈*) that was sacrificed during the Glorification Ceremony. Since, when the context is clear, anointment always occurs alongside the performance of a Glorification Ceremony, it appears that the *Ī* for unction is always fat derived from the sacrificial ewe.³⁷¹ As a substance in a semi-solid state, rubbing is a more appropriate method of application than pouring.

Ritual purity and purification is an issue at stake elsewhere in the *zukru* festival, particularly concerning animals.³⁷² Emar 373 is one of only two texts that specify a state of purity for any of its sacrificial offerings.³⁷³ If the pure state of the animals signifies an absence of physical blemishes, as is known in the Hebrew Bible³⁷⁴ and Hittite ritual practices,³⁷⁵ then the state of purity should be a pre-existing quality of the animal. But on the first day of preparations for the *zukru* ritual, SAG.MU 15 in the sixth year, the text calls for “all the oxen and sheep” to be purified (*ullulu*), which reveals that the purity of

³⁶⁹ Line 168. Cf. page 269.

³⁷⁰ Emar 369:21, 35. Note also line 4, where oil is “placed” (*šakānu*) on the woman’s head.

³⁷¹ The fat of sheep (*Ī.UDU*) is removed for distribution of ritual portions in Emar 369:80 (Fleming, *Installation*, line 78) and 388:64. It also occurs in less clear contexts in Emar 408:64 and 472:10. The latter, a ritual for the gods of Hatti, notably prescribes roasting (*šubšulu*) in fire in the following line, which is reminiscent of the roasting of a ewe in the Glorification Ceremony. The highly broken context prevents us from knowing whether this text describes a similar procedure.

³⁷² On the “pure lambs” used in the *zukru* festival, see pages 241-42.

³⁷³ Cf. Emar 370:45 and passim.

³⁷⁴ Meshel, “Pure, Impure, Permitted, Prohibited,” 32-42.

³⁷⁵ Alice Mouton, “Reinheit (Pureté). B. Bei den Hethitern,” *RLA* 11, 299.

animals is also a condition that can be ritually effected. There is no hint of the procedure undertaken to purify the cattle, and nothing like it is ever prescribed elsewhere in the Emar texts.³⁷⁶ Since the purification of animals takes place on the first day of a ritual complex that insists on the purity of sacrificial animals throughout, it is a reasonable assumption that the animals being purified are those that will later be sacrificed. However, it cannot be ruled out that the purification is for the benefit of all cattle belonging to Emarite herdsman, though it is doubtful that a need for such a state of purity in animals outside of cultic use would have existed.

Sacred Space and Dagan's Perambulation at the sikkānu Gate

The movement of Dagan in his wagon between/among the *sikkānu*-stones is a major focus of Part II of the text, occurring on each of the four days whose events are enumerated (Year 6: SAG.MU 15, Niqalu 25; Year 7: SAG.MU 15, 21). This movement serves to initiate the return procession, though it clearly has its own ritual significance, as well. That Dagan must “pass” (*etēqu*) between/among the stones is a more descriptive ritual movement than the simple act of “going out” (*uṣû*) that described the departure of his procession from the city. Still, the act of “passing,” by itself, is nondescript; it is the action's persistent repetition over the course of the festival events that give it the character of a ritual ambulation.

Because the rite always occurs at the same place, its location is an integral part of its performance. The location called the “Gate of the *sikkānu*-Stones” (KÁ^{na4.meš}*si-(ik-)**ka-na-ti*) is really the epicenter of *zukru* festival events. This is the destination of the

³⁷⁶ The only comparable instance is Emar 452:53, where “the city” is purified (*kuppuru*). Here also there are no details given for the enactment of the procedure.

processional routes outside of the city, where the festival's numerous offerings to the deities are presented. It is also the setting for at least one Glorification Ceremony and the location of Dagan's perambulation rite. Indeed, the involvement of *sikkānu*-stones is among the most notable shared features of the *zukru* versions, which suggests that in some way it stands at the very core of *zukru* practice.³⁷⁷

Whatever the nature of the ritual space associated with the *sikkānu*-stones, the execution of the ritual performances at a place of entrance is ritually significant. This localization mirrors the placement of the Glorification ceremonies at the Central City Gate and the performance of the same rite at the entrance (KÁ) to ^dIŠKUR's temple courtyard in another ritual (Emar 369:9), as well as the feast at the entrance of ^dIŠKUR's temple in that same event (Emar 369:15). These rites occur at the *limen* between sacred and mundane spaces, or, in the case of the Central City Gate, the threshold between the natural and the constructed worlds. Though it would be imprecise to categorize the *zukru* festival as a rite of passage, the localization of rites at threshold locations is a highly symbolic atmosphere that reinforces the liminal experience noted in other elements of the ritual and symbolizes the passage between nature and cultivation—a celebration of agro-pastoralism.

Because of the uncertainty about the nature of the ritual space, there is also a lack of clarity regarding the execution of the perambulation rite that occurs there. If the *sikkānu*-stones are the pillars of a gate, then a direct, linear movement is the most likely manner of Dagan's passage between the stones, either at a single time-point or as a

³⁷⁷ Seeing the longer version of the *zukru* as formed through successive expansions to the more minimal practice attested in Emar 375, Fleming identifies the processions to and from the *sikkānu*-stones as the “center of the *zukru*” (*Time at Emar*, 96-98).

repetitive action. But if many *sikkānu*-stones were present, perhaps themselves constituting the enclosed space, then Dagan could be seen as passing between each of multiple sets of stones.

The special uncertainty leaves us to evaluate the rite based on the type of action it involves: ambulation. The best examples of ambulatory rituals from the ancient Near East come from Egypt, where *circumambulation* was employed widely in many types of ritual performances.³⁷⁸ Robert Ritner's studies of magical encircling demonstrate a number of overlapping significances for the rite, which might be summarized as purification, protection, and delineation of sacred space.³⁷⁹ In funerary ritual, a procession might encircle the tomb prior to entry to prepare the location for reception of the deceased. In coronation rituals, circumambulation of city walls or regional territory represents the circumscription of the sacred space that constitutes the kingdom and effectuates divine protection of its borders. The confluence of powers of the ambulatory rite is especially glimpsed in the dedication ritual for a temple at Edfu, where "the king and priests go about the temple, simultaneously purifying the site, delimiting its sacred/cosmic space, and protecting it from external, demonic forces."³⁸⁰

The preparation of sacred space may also be the best explanation for the ambulatory rite in KTU³ 1.112:6-7, where the king's children "ascend" ('*ly*) seven times to a particular temple or sanctuary (*hmn*).³⁸¹ This directly precedes the one-time ascension ('*ly*) of divine statues to the same place (line 8). It is the act of movement by

³⁷⁸ Robert Ritner, "Magic," in *The Ancient Gods Speak: A Guide to Egyptian Religion* (ed. Donald Redford; Oxford: University Press, 2002), 197.

³⁷⁹ Robert Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice* (SAOC 54; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1993), 57-60.

³⁸⁰ Ritner, *Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, 61.

³⁸¹ On the destination of the children's ascension, see Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 101 n. 21.

the designated ritual participants at the designated ritual spaces that effectuates the state of preparedness necessary for the deities to occupy the space.

Similar objectives obtain to the Israelites' circumambulation of Jericho in the Hebrew Bible (Jos 6:3, 11). The ritual movements around the city dedicate the territory to the deity, making it a space for divine action. Undoubtedly, the ritual relates to the application of *ḥērem*, the "ban" that sets apart and dedicates spaces, objects, animals, and people for the god. In this way, these things are made sacred and, as such, must be destroyed since they are the prerogative of the god, alone.

The delimiting and preparation/purification of sacred space is the common thread that runs through rituals in which repetitive movement at or around a specified location is the primary ritual action. Since Emar's *sikkānu*-stones themselves likely have just such a function, Dagan's perambulatory action reinforces the circumscription of the ritual space. Accordingly, Dagan's beat among the stones may be an additional component of the purification rituals that have already been noted in relation to these objects.

Days of Consecration

We have already seen that unction with blood and oil serves both to purify and to consecrate—that is, to mark the holy nature of the anointed object. But this is not the only expression of consecration found in the festival text. Emar 373+ shares in the broader Emarite ritual tradition by staking out ritual time designated as "Consecration Days" (*ūmī qadduṣī*).³⁸² In the context of a multi-day festival, the Consecration Day is the first day—

³⁸² The act of consecrating (*qadduṣu*) is expressed verbally once in the text, line 205, which seems to return to describing the opening events of the festival's preparation yet a third time. Since the tablet comes to a full break at this point, it is impossible to discern what followed, the indirect addition of Emar 374 notwithstanding.

the inaugural event of the festival.³⁸³ Presumably in such cases not only are the ritual objects and participants consecrated, but also the coming festival days, themselves. The duration of the festival is set apart as sacred time. Since the term “Consecration Day” may also describe a single-day ritual event, the marking of ritual time in this way is not reserved for prolonged rituals. The Consecration Day cordons off any temporal span as sacred time.

Although the naming of Consecration Days is common to Emarite ritual, the *zukru* festival gives it a somewhat different expression. First, it contains more than one Consecration Day. One is encountered in the most expected place: on the first day of the festival, itself, the 15th of SAG.MU in the seventh year. But another consecration occurs during the sixth year preparations, over the two-day period of Niqualu 24-25.³⁸⁴ The use of multiple consecration days also occurs in the NIN.DINGIR installation text. In addition to the Consecration Day at the inauguration of installation ceremony, itself, that festival contains a special Consecration Day specifically associated with the shaving ceremony that takes place prior to the installation. Consecration Days are thus not limited to one per ritual complex and can serve to demarcate ritual time within the same, broader event.

The *zukru* festival is unique, however, in observing a consecration nearly a full year prior to the main event. Since the consecration on the 24th-25th of Niqualu does not specify association with any other ritual procedure, as seen with the NIN.DINGIR shaving consecration, it seems that the prior-year consecration is a part of the *zukru*

³⁸³ The conception of the Consecration Day as the first day of a festival, rather than a day that is separate from the festival, itself, is seen most clearly in two of the *kissu* texts, Emar 385 and 386 (= *ASJ* 14 49). These begin with specification of rites for the Consecration Day, before describing procedures for “the second day” (Emar 385:10; *ASJ* 14 49:1).

³⁸⁴ Emar 373+:33 makes clear this discrete period by offering a sum total of animal offerings from both the 24th and 25th of Niqualu, referring to these animals as dedicated for “the Consecration.”

preparations, along with the veiling of the divine statue, that initiate the “*zuku* season,” designating this as a holy period.

The instruction in line 193 to “perform the rites of the Consecration Day” implies that it involved a distinct complex of events that was either known to the intended audience of the text or written on a separate and undiscovered tablet. Those Consecration Day rites, which were performed at the Central City Gate, correspond to performance of the Glorification Ceremony at the same location in Part 1 of the text.³⁸⁵ The Consecration rite, however, is not simply an alternate name for the Glorification Ceremony, since the Glorification is found at non-consecrating engagements such as the final day of the festival.³⁸⁶ The suggestion is, rather, that the Glorification Ceremony is one component of the Consecration Day rites. Otherwise, the activities of the Consecration Day likely amounted to providing food and drink offerings that are not dissimilar from those given on other ritual days.³⁸⁷

³⁸⁵ Emar 373:62.

³⁸⁶ Emar 373+:166.

³⁸⁷ Most of the texts that mention a Consecration Day go on to say that the gods (or a specified god) should be consecrated (*quddušu*) with food offerings, commonly (*hukku*-)bread, beer, and fruitcakes. Cf. Emar 369:6, 22; 385:3-4, 27-29; 387:1-2; 394:26-28; *ASJ* 14 49:1-4, 20-23. Fleming points out that it is probably not the gods, themselves, who are consecrated, but rather the offering to them. Exemplar D of Emar 385 makes this explicit by making “the gods” the indirect object of the clause, rather than the direct object, as is usual for this phrase (*Installation*, 161).

PART I CONCLUSION
THE *ZUKRU* TRADITIONS

The meaning of the word “zukru”

Outside of its occurrence at Emar and in a single text from Mari, the word “*zukru*” is not attested in the Semitic languages. Other than its lack of attestation, the form—a *qutl* noun of the root **zkr*—is not remarkable. That root has the common Semitic meaning of “naming, declaring; invoking.” The term “*zukru*” may be identical in meaning to the Akkadian noun *zikru*, “mention,” (cf. Arb. *ḍikr*, Heb. *zēker*), though the variation in vowel pattern does not appear to be a mere local aberration. Several personal names at Emar contain the element *zikru* in well-attested name forms, vocalized in the expected *qitl* form, which shows the *qutl* pattern was not simply a dialectical pronunciation of the noun. Moreover, the form “*zukru*” is consistent between Emar and Mari, the documentation for which is separated by several hundred years. The use of the same form of the word in a specialized manner (referring to the ritual) in both archives suggests that “*zukru*” is a standardized term.

As a derivative of **zkr*, Fleming suggests that the term refers to an “invocation” of the deity—an action that is also known to be expressed in Akkadian with the infinitival construction “*zakār šumi* [DN].” It would represent a “verbal complement to offering” and a “spoken approach” to worshipping the god.¹ Fleming points to comparable acts of invocation in oath-taking procedures, especially at Mari, where the gods stand as guarantors of the agreement. Perhaps not coincidentally, the “swearing of an oath” is an action also designated by the verb *zakāru* in some such texts. In support of Fleming’s

¹ Fleming, *Time at Emar* 122-24.

suggestion, if “*zuku*” has the same semantic range as “*zikru*,” then the occasional usage of the latter with the meaning “oath” might indicate that the Emarites “give an oath to Dagan” with this ritual.² However, there is no support in the actual goings-on of the event that indicates an oath-taking procedure.

Deriving from the same verbal root, we might alternatively understand *zuku* to indicate “praise.” Such is the shade of *zakāru* in an Old Babylonian letter that entreats, “Let us praise (*i nizkurma*) our lord and may those who would shame us themselves come to shame.”³ This nuance is also well known in the west. In the liturgical language of the Psalms, the Hebrew term *zēker* (cognate to Akkadian *zikru*) employed frequently in parallel with, or as a direct object of, **ydh*, “praise.” Such is the case, for example, in Ps. 6:6 “In death there is no *zēker* for you / who will give you praise in Sheol? //”⁴ Since the *zuku* ritual is written in the broad framework of honoring the chief god, Dagan, the name of the festival may refer simply to an occasion upon which the people give praise to the deity through the specified ritual offerings and actions.

There is another option for etymologizing “*zuku*” that sidesteps the problem of the unexpected vowel pattern. A cluster of second millennium personal names, spread especially across the Mesopotamian periphery (Alalah, Ugarit, Mari, Nuzi, though also Nippur), and other Hurrian-influenced areas (Hattuša, Elahut) contain an element written *Zu-uk-rV* or *Šu-uk-rV*.⁵ Although most treatments of such names leave them untranslated,

² Cf. CAD Z s.v. *zikru* A mng. 5.

³ CT 4 2:32. Cf. CAD Z s.v. *zakāru* mng 2a-4’.

⁴ Cf. also Ps. 30:5; 91:12; 102:13; 135:13; 145:7.

⁵ From Ugarit, e.g. *Zu-uk-ri-ia-na*; cf. François Thureau-Dangin, “Un comptoir de laine pourpre à Ugarit d’après une tablette de Ras-Shamra,” *Syria* 15 (1934): 138, 139. *Zu-uk-ri-ia-nu* (PRU 3 199 I 8) = Ugaritic *dkry* (KTU³ 4.261:5) Cf. John Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription* (HSS 32; Atlanta: Scholar’s Press, 1987), 225; *Zu-uk-ri-ia* (PRU 6 50:25; *Ugaritica* 5 27:9). From Nippur, e.g. EN-*zu-uk-ri* [CBS 3480; cf. Albert Clay, *Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Cassite Period* (YOS 1; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912), 75]. From Alalah, e.g. *Šu-uk-ri-ya* (AIT 71:2). *Zu-uk-*

they agree that the etymology is Hurrian.⁶ This accounts for the varying Z ~ Š orthography of what seems to be the same element—the representation of the voiced allophone of the Hurrian consonantal phoneme /s/ in cuneiform varied regionally between Z and Š.⁷ The root of this name element, *šugr-*, may denote the act of “blessing” or “protecting.” Its derived noun, *šugri*, is attested in texts from Hattuša, signifying a “blessing” or “wish.”⁸ If our *zukru* is related to this Hurrian term—in which case it would be treated as Semitic in the text with a standard Akkadian nominal declension—then the name of the ritual might reflect a celebration of the divine aegis the city enjoys under Dagan, by his protection and blessing.

The problem of etymologizing the name of the ritual through Hurrian is the lack of distinguishable Hurrian influence elsewhere in the *zukru* practice. There is certainly a degree of Hurrian influence on the Emarite ritual system, in general, as can also be observed in other Syro-Palestinian ritual forms that post-date the rise of the Hurrians, such as the use of birds as sacrificial burnt offerings. But no particular such ritual form that is attributable to the Hurrians is a distinct feature of the *zukru*, such that would account for framing the entire practice in Hurrian terms. On the other hand, it is possible that the Hurrian descriptor for this type of ritual was adopted quite early (cf. the attestation of *zukru* at OB Mari) and, as it was incorporated into Syrian ritual practice, lost its uniquely Hurrian character in the minds of those who practiced it. That is, rather

ri-ya (AIT 409:33). *Zu-uk-ra-si* (AIT 28). *Šu-uk-ru-ma-al-li* (AIT 451:12). From Mari, *Šu-uk-rum-te-šu-ub* (*Syria* 19 116; *RA* 35 184:44), which is also known from Nuzi; cf. Ignace Gelb, *Nuzi Personal Names* (OIP 57; Chicago: University Press, 1943), 259.

⁶ Cf., e.g., Gelb, *Nuzi Personal Names*, 259 s.v. *šukr*.

⁷ Cf. Ilse Wegner, *Einführung in die hurritische Sprache* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000), 37.

⁸ See Richter, *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*, 409 s.v. *šugri*. Cf. also s.v. *šugr-*.

than being a “borrowed” Hurrian ritual idea, the *šugri* > *zukru* celebration would have been entirely adopted and assimilated into native practice.

This brief survey only raises the possibilities for etymologizing the name of the ritual. The evidence is not sufficient to propose a conclusion. In any case, the name of the ritual does not obviously correspond in any intimate way with the actions that are observable in the text’s description. At best, the relationship is generic, as a description of the event as an act of praise or expression of a wish for continued blessing and protection.

The zukru rituals: A Synthetic View

To this point I have treated the details of the texts independently to attempt to flesh out as fully as possible the nature of the elements that combine to create a ritual that is distinctively *zukru*. But the higher order question remains: what *was* the *zukru* ritual for the population who observed it? As is true of all ritual, meaning is never static nor is the perception of it consistently shared among practitioners. Accordingly, it would be fallacious even to strive for a single interpretation of the practice that defined its meaning or purpose, as a whole. Instead, we should trace the threads of individual traits to their points of intersections with one another and attempt to discern the various patterns in the resulting weave. These concluding remarks work towards this goal by offering a synthetic perspective on the data already explored and probing them for suggestions of how the Emarite citizens might have perceived their significance.

The first and most fundamental element in contextualizing the ritual is its setting within the calendar and seasons of the year. Fleming has discussed at length the difficulties in knowing whether the Emar lunar calendar was adjusted to the solar year

through intercalation or rather allowed to drift through the seasons. It seems inevitable, as Fleming concludes, that intercalary adjustment occurred, perhaps simply without any supplementary notation in date formulae that would alert the reader to the distinction between a primary and intercalary month. Indeed, it is the calendrical rituals that most adamantly suggest the necessity of seasonal adjustment, since connections to the agricultural year are sometimes evident in them.

Indeed, such agricultural associations have already been mentioned in the discussion of the *zukru*, though a strict focus on farming would be much too limiting for this ritual. It would be better to view the *zukru* in terms of concern for life-giving or (re-) productivity, as it applies in a broad sense to cultivation and husbandry—what I have referred to as agro-pastoralism. This type of interest is on display in the prominent role of the festival version's leading player, Dagan, Lord of the First Fruit. Primogeniture is recognized as an important aspect of the life-giving process for the deity, who may be owed a debt for his bestowal of life to the benefit of the Emarite community. This Lord of the First Fruit was worshipped at the beginning of autumn, with the onset of planting fall crops, creating an absolute link between the ritual practice and a fixed point in the solar year can be seen.

Underscoring the theme of vivification, especially through cultivation, is the peculiar preference of the *zukru* festival text to recommend cooked cereal offerings rather than the raw grains that are commonly used in the rituals. As we have seen, this intentional divergence operates as a symbol of civilization, perhaps especially with a perception of superiority over the state of nature. It is another reflection of the abundance of life that is created through the intervention of humanity in nature under divine aegis.

Certainly, though, the ritual has strong associations with nature. After all, the primary setting for the performance is a location outside of the city that contains naturalistic representations of divinity. The visit to the ‘Gate’ of the Upright Stones by Dagan, his host of deities, and the human faithful is a communal recognition of the power in nature. But, this location is not occupied by the participants for long; the procession soon returns them with a rite of entrance into the city. As the ritualization of the entry shows, the return is not simply a matter of putting away the statues and returning home. Rather, it tells a story of mastery over nature and the progression towards civilization. Because of the symbolic significance of the extramural location in the theme of overcoming nature in favor of cultivation, I cannot accept Arnaud’s conclusion, based on the prime role of the outdoor shrine, that the *zukru* must have originated in Syria prior to urbanization.⁹ Quite the contrary, I see the natural shrine as the attempt on the part of urbanites to project an archaic setting, the power of which is harnessed, channeled, and amplified in the practices of civilization.

Fleming emphasizes the importance of ritualizing the seasonal axes, observing that not only the *zukru* but also the Babylonian *akītu* and additional Hittite rituals associate themselves with these anchors of the year. Because of the importance of these time periods, he rightly notes, major ritual events, regardless of their purposes, were attracted to them as fixed dates. The content of the rite need not be “essentially agricultural or seasonal.”¹⁰ Yet, the *zukru*, in practice, does exhibit inextricable links to the seasonal activities that surround it. In the diachronic view, this may, indeed, be a

⁹ Daniel Arnaud, “La bibliothèque d’un devin Syrien à Meskéné-Emar (Syrie),” *CRAI* (1980): 384-85. Fleming partially accepts Arnaud’s conclusion; *Time at Emar*, 139.

¹⁰ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 139.

result of the combination of pre-existing seasonal rites with other practices perceived as more distinctly *zukru*-related. In fact, as we have seen, the 15th of Zarātu rites in Emar 446 might reflect just such a precursor to a proper *zukru* ritual in Emar. But whether this is the case or, contrarily, the *zukru* was always conceived as related to its season, it remains true that the “essence” of the ritual in the forms that we know it—and the forms in which the Emarites of this period experienced it—is unavoidably associated with the agricultural cycle.

Still, the *zukru* is not a monolith. Its parts reflect varying interests. Fleming focuses especially on the visit to the *sikkānu*-stones to conclude that the ritual is a celebration of the dominion of Dagan and its extension beyond the city. Indeed, the performance of the ritual is couched in terms of “giving” it to Dagan, suggesting that honoring Dagan is the fundamental rubric within which the event takes place. And no reader would deny that this elaborate event focused on Dagan affirms his primacy in the Emarite cult. But this aspect no more encapsulates the “essence” of the ritual than the other noted features and might, itself, be an element that is exaggerated in the later version of the ritual due to the ideological interests of imperialism.

Finally, there is a noted interest in matters of purity in *zukru* practice that is not as finely articulated in the other local rituals. This is evident first of all in the preference for sacrificial offerings of pure lambs, which is attested elsewhere only in the festival for the installation of the *maš’artu*-priestess where the inventory of six pure lambs pales in comparison to the *zukru* festival’s seven hundred. Additionally, the *zukru* in both versions harbors an active prescription to “purify” some component of livestock and perhaps the meat that derives from their slaughter (Emar 373+:176; 375+:10). Through unction, the

upright stones are both purified and recognized as transcendent objects. The rubbing of the gods' statues with tamarisk (perhaps dipped in oil) shows a concern for cleansing the earthly manifestation of the deities.

This focus on purity might indicate that, among the ritual's other interests, a periodic cleansing of the sancta is undertaken in the seven-day course of events. This might even be a (secondary?) function of the procession of the gods out of their temples: it provides an opportunity for both the gods themselves and their abodes to be purified. Evidence for such a practice might be sought in the fragmentary lines of the shorter *zukru* text, which continue to reference temples even after the primary setting of events has moved outside of the city. It is feasible, though un-provable, that such prescriptions deal with instructions for cleansing the temples while the gods are away. All these purification requirements hint at a cycle of purification for divine beings and sacred spaces of Emar.

Thus it is clear that the "meaning" of the *zukru* ritual can only be sought in a nexus of interests that are woven together into a fabric that blurs their boundaries. Especially my analysis of the manifestations of the primary deities of the festival has pointed toward beseeching agro-pastoral fecundity to be the most clearly communicated purpose of the ritual, perhaps particularly as envisioned by the ritual specialists who would have orchestrated it. But, of course, treating such details does not tell the whole story of the ritual as an experience of the citizens of Late Bronze Age Emar. Any of the noted features, be it the emphasis on fall planting, the honoring of the chief god, the purification of the sancta, or some other aspect that has escaped my attention, could resonant with primary importance to different individual participants whose social location would affect their experience of the event, at different chronological time points,

each of which offers a unique set of outside circumstances that contextualize the ritual experience.

Everything I have treated thus far deals only with what we might consider the emic interpretation of the ritual. As with all rituals, there is another level of evaluation: that which looks to the impact of the performance on the social and political environments of the participants. This etic perspective occupies the remainder of the present work.

CHAPTER 4

EMAR IN THE LATE BRONZE AGE: HISTORY, POLITICS, AND CHRONOLOGY

The overall objective of this project is to understand the *zukru* rituals not only in ritual and religious context but also as products of their socio-political world. This goal requires that we first paint a picture of Emar society and political history during the Late Bronze Age. This chapter addresses the need for contextualization with a historical sketch of the changes in Emarite politics during the archival period. Because this period is marked by the competing, expansionist aims of the so-called “great powers” (Egypt, Hatti, Mittani, Babylonia, and, later, Assyria), and potentially witnesses the subjugation of Emar to two of these powers in succession, it is impossible to divorce Emarite politics from the international political scene. Thus, it is necessary first to account for the history of Late Bronze Syria with respect to international politics in order to appreciate the resonance of such events at the local level in Emar.

In addition to defining the historical outlines of the period in question, this chapter will offer a more detailed probe into the nature and development of Emar’s political institutions, which was deferred in the previous chapters, paying special attention to the development of local kingship and the nature of the Hittite apparatus that appears alongside the city government in the thirteenth century. The aim of the chapter is to be descriptive, though the nature of the sources almost always demands a degree of interpretation. This requires facing historical issues about which consensus is still in flux in Emar scholarship. In such cases—notably including the chronology of the Conventional Format documentation—I strive to give a diplomatic treatment of the arguments and proceed by building upon what I take to be the most secure interpretations

of the historical data. In the next chapter, the data extracted from the analysis of the *zukru* rituals will be integrated into the historical picture drawn here to reveal a more complex understanding of the practice within its socio-political setting.

North Syria in the Late Bronze Age

The political developments that shape the history of Emar especially in the thirteenth century have their roots in the mid-second millennium transition from the Near Eastern Middle Bronze (MB) to the Late Bronze Age (LB; c. 1550 B.C.E.).¹ This transitional phase is largely obscure due to a decline in textual documentation that accompanied and seems to have been a consequence of a changing political environment. The established powers of the MB III world order, which were already in decline by the end of that era, were finally destabilized at the beginning of the sixteenth century with the attacks of the Hittite Old Kingdom ruler, Muršili I. His southward campaign in the early 16th century delivered him the destruction of Aleppo—at that time the capital of the regional power, Yamḥad, which probably also held influence over Emar—after which he marched on to sack Babylon, bringing an end to Old Babylonian ascendancy and clearing the way for the rise of the Kassites in southern Mesopotamia. Muršili maintained no lasting presence in Syria or Mesopotamia in this period, but the effect of his destructions

¹ The dates in this study adhere in general to the middle chronology presented by J.A. Brinkman, “Appendix: Mesopotamian Chronology of the Historical Period” in A. Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 335-48, with some modifications. Progress in Near Eastern chronology favors an adjusted middle chronology. Cf. Gojko Barjamovic, Thomas Hertel, and Mogens Trolle Larsen, *Ups and Downs at Kanesh: Chronology, History, and Society in the Old Assyrian Period* (PIHANS 120; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012). Such is also the result of the 13th century chronological study by Yigal Bloch, “Studies in Middle Assyrian Chronology and Its Implications for the History of the Ancient Near East in the 13th Century B.C.E.” (PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2012), which forms the basis for the dating of Assyrian kings, here. In 2013, the Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale in Ghent held a workshop entitled “Towards an Absolute Chronology of the Ancient Near East,” the publication of which is anxiously awaited.

was upheaval in the status quo powers. Around the same time, the Hyksos were seizing power in Lower Egypt, initiating the so-called Second Intermediate Period during which Egypt was divided and weak. In Palestine, destruction levels are attested in the archaeology of many settlements as MB III came to an end. But the significance of the transition is more political than cultural. There is continuity in terms of material culture from MB to LB, despite the often violent shuffling of powers across the Near East. The LB transition was a disruption rather than a collapse.² The change of the era can be seen as a political shift—a re-setting of the balances of political power—from which emerged a very different political landscape.

Perhaps the most significant consequence of this transition period in terms of international politics is the rise of the Hurrian state, Mittani, with its seat in Upper Mesopotamia.³ There is no direct evidence that attests to the formation and hegemonic expansion of Mitanni. When substantial documentation begins to appear at Nuzi, Alalah level IV, and, later, during the Amarna period, Mitanni appears as a vastly influential international power, though already on the brink of decline. As a result, even basic information such as the extent of Mittanian power and the nature of its administration of the territories that owed some allegiance to it can only be based on inference from limited and scattered data.

The political reach of Mittani cannot be determined with precision, but historians sometimes deduce that from the mid-fifteenth century until its fall to the Hittites under

² Cf. Mario Liverani, *The Ancient Near East: History, Society, and Economy* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 273.

³ The (primary) capital of Mittani was Waššukkanni, which has yet to be identified archaeologically with confidence, but is believed by many to occupy the location of Tell Fakhariya on the Ḫabur.

Šuppiluliuma I, Mittani ruled over the entirety of north Syria.⁴ There is some documentary evidence to support that claim. The statue inscription of Idrimi, which details that king's rise to power in Alalah in the early LB, shows explicitly that a Mittanian overlord—in this case, Parrattarna—already held sway so far west as the northwest corner of Syria.⁵ Idrimi, a royal scion of Aleppo whose family fled the city in crisis, managed to regain a position of royalty in Alalah, but only with the blessing of Parrattarna, who appears to have controlled the region.⁶ The inscription is forthright about Idrimi's submission to the Mittanian ruler and indicates no attempts to rebel against or resist the ruling power.

Although the Idrimi inscription is problematic as a historical source, its basic claims about the Hurrian supremacy at Alalah are substantiated by other documentation.

⁴ The date of the rise of Mittani is clouded by the lack of textual production during the time of its ascent. Even the references to the authority of Mittanian kings at Alalah need not necessarily imply a well-developed Mittanian “state” that would have been especially influential elsewhere. On the emergence of Mittani, see Stefano de Martino, “The Mittani State: The Formation of the Kingdom of Mittani” in *Constituent, Confederate, and Conquered Space: The Emergence of the Mittani State* (eds. Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, Nicole Brisch, and Jesper Eidem; Topoi, Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 17; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 61-74.

⁵ The *editio princeps* was published by Sidney Smith, *The Statue of Idri-mi* (Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara 1; London: British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, 1949). Several complete, updated editions have followed, e.g. Manfred Dietrich and Oswald Loretz, “Die Inschrift der Statue des Königs Idimi von Alalah,” *UF* 13 (1981): 201-69. The most recent print edition was offered by Jean-Marie Durand, “La fondation d'une lignée royale syrienne. Le geste d'Idrimi d'Alalah” in *Le jeune héros: Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien* (eds. Jean-Marie Durand, Thomas Römer and Michel Langlois; OBO 250; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2011), 94-150. Cf. also the electronic edition by Jacob Lauinger, <http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/aemw/alalakh/idrimi/> (cited August, 2016). The Idrimi inscription is problematic as a historical source since it is clearly an apologetic novella, serving to legitimate the ascension of Idrimi to the throne of Alalah. Its use here is not to endorse any of its specific historical claims, but rather to highlight the features contained in the background of its narrative that hint at usable historical details, or at least paint a picture of what historical reconstruction would have looked plausible to its audience. The statue was discovered in a later archaeological level than that which would correspond to the events it describes. [For the issue of exactly which level the statue belongs to, see Amir Fink, “Where was the Statue of Idrimi Actually Found? The Later Temples of Tell Atchana (Alalakh) Revisited,” *UF* 39 (2008): 162-245]. The excavator, Leonard Woolley (in Smith, *Idrimi*, 2) interpreted it as a preservation from the earlier period, not doubting the authenticity of its authorship by Idrimi, who narrates in the first person. It is possible, however, that the artifact is an original product of the later level, making it an archaizing piece casting itself pseudepigraphically into the past.

⁶ Idrimi, line 45. Cf. Dietrich and Loretz, “Die Inschrift der Statue des Königs Idimi von Alalah,” 205.

AIT 3, a treaty between Alalah (under Idrimi) and Kizzuwatna, was drafted under the auspices of Parrattarna—the same figure who is called “king of the Hurrian troops” in the Idrimi inscription, though he is given no official title in AIT 3.

A more detailed treaty drawn up by Idrimi’s successor, Niqmepa, with Ir-Teššub of Tunip (AIT 2) contains a pledge of non-opposition to “the Hurrian troops and the king of the Hurrian troops.” Six other documents containing legal decisions or official letters relating to consequences of legal decisions attest to the overlordship of a Hurrian king (apparently Šauštatar, successor to Parrattarna, in all cases), before whom certain disputes were decided.⁷ This direct evidence is supplemented by the observable “Hurrianization” of Alalah reflected in the texts of Level IV (LB) as compared to the only prior text-yielding archaeological context, Level VII (MB).⁸ Thus it is clear that LB Alalah was impacted substantially by a cultural and political Hurrian dominance. In a traditional view of imperialism, these data would be understood to indicate a territorially expansive empire that dominated the landscape from Upper Mesopotamia to the Mediterranean in the 16th century.⁹

But for the purpose of determining the scope of Mittanian control in Syria—in the present case, specifically, for understanding the relationship of the Hurrian state to Emar—the situation at Alalah may be only partly illustrative. Recent studies have begun to recognize that the territorial “inkblot” model of empire is not the only or the best understanding in some cases of imperial politics. Eva von Dassow has been at the

⁷ AIT 13, 14, 108, 110, 111, 112.

⁸ The “Hurrianization” is primarily observed in onomastic patterns, which in no way indicates the presence of actual ethnic Hurrians. The foundational study on the naming patterns in Alalah and their development from level VII to level IV was undertaken by Anne Draffkorn, “Hurrians and Hurrian at Alalah: An Ethno-Linguistic Analysis” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1959).

⁹ Cf. e.g. Amélie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East c. 3000-330 BC Volume One* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 296.

forefront of pressing this point for LB Syria: the best understanding of Mittanian hegemony in Syria, she suggests, is not one of a broad and unified territory under central administration. Hegemonic control could only realistically be effected in the major urban centers, themselves, with little reach to their supporting hinterlands. “Therefore the map of Mittani’s empire should instead be visualized as a network of points of control, each point the seat of a kingdom or province and each situated within in its own cluster of points; the space between or beyond these linked nodes can scarcely be counted for the domain of Mittani or any other territorial state.”¹⁰ While Emar would certainly have been an urban center and seat of government in its micro-region during this period and nothing like the untouched hinterlands von Dassow describes, I nonetheless accept her caution when considering the infiltration of Mittani. Although the well-documented Hurrian control at Alalah in the far west could be taken to imply domination of all the territories between the western coast and the Mittanian capital on the Ḫabur, in point of fact it cannot be assumed that Hurrian domination in the interior space was complete or that any power, actual or formal, was exercised in any regional kingdom such as Aštata.

If the territoriality of Mittani on the Middle Euphrates is not taken for granted, then Emar’s relationship to Mittani must be assessed independently. The earliest characterization of Emar during the height of Mittanian power stems, once again, from the Idrimi inscription, which might lend credence to the notion that Emar stood outside of Mittani’s sphere of influence—or at least was perceived by the inscription’s author to have done so. The inscription relates that after Idrimi and his family were forced out of

¹⁰ Eva von Dassow, “Levantine Polities under Mittanian Hegemony,” in *Constituent, Confederate, and Conquered Space: The Emergence of the Mittani State* (ed. Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, Nicole Brisch, and Jesepser Eidem; Topoi. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 17; Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2014), 14-15.

Aleppo, they fled to Emar. The “(leading) men of Emar” (LÚ^{hi.a} uru *E-mar*^{ki}) were relatives of Idrimi’s mother, which guaranteed safe haven.¹¹

Although the trouble in Aleppo is never described with specificity, it is not unlikely that it would have been related to the encroachment of Mittani, even if only indirectly.¹² Alalah soon came under the political umbrella of Mittani, even as Idrimi continued to rule there. But there is no indication that Emar, which was a safe haven—apparently from Mittani—for the disaffected rulers of Aleppo, was affected by such foreign interventions. So, to whatever degree we accept the Idrimi inscription as historical evidence, we must note that it portrays Emar in the period prior to Emar’s own archives as a city not appreciably affected by Hurrian control.

If Emar was largely free of Mittanian influence in LB I, circumstances may have developed differently as Emar’s LB II archives come to light. Some of Emar’s earliest documents, datable to the 14th century very likely attest to a relationship with Mittani. A small group of four texts, known as the “*arana* documents,” records the sales of assets by the city in order to raise funds for the “*arana* of the king.”¹³ Arnaud translated *arana* as “trésor,” a conjectural, extended meaning of Akkadian *arānu* “chest,” which allowed a

¹¹ LÚ^{hi.a} is probably used here to designate a ruling class, as is attested in EA Akkadian for the identification of regional kings in letters to the Great Kings. Daniel Fleming pointed to the distinction between LÚ^{meš} and DUMU^{meš} in Mari Akkadian, where the former indicates political actors in a place while the latter implies only residence in the city [*Democracy’s Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 188-90].

¹² Cf. Sidney Smith, *The Statue of Idri-mi*, 60.

¹³ The texts are AuOrS1 14, 15; Emar 153; and *ASJ* 12 2. The comparative restorations of the four texts that offer the clearest picture of the *arana* clause were assembled by Masamichi Yamada, “‘Arana-Documents’ from Emar, *Orient* 29 (1993), 139-46. Yamada, however, interprets the term “*Arana*” as the proper name of an otherwise unattested king of Emar—a suggestion which is no longer plausible after the recognition of the first dynasty of Emarite kings. Cf. Aaron Skaist, “The Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar,” *ZA* 88 (1998): 45-71.

picture of *arana* as tribute to emerge.¹⁴ Subsequently, Aaron Skaist raised the possibility that the word, which never appears in a normal Akkadian declension, is actually a Hurrian term derived from the verbal base *ar-* “to give” meaning roughly the same thing as Arnaud has supposed: “tribute.”¹⁵ The payment of a tribute notated in Hurrian terminology would suggest that the beneficiary of the funds was Mittani. This understanding also fits the chronological picture, since the *arana* documents belong to members of the Emarite First Royal House, the early members of which predated the Hittite takeover.¹⁶

The argument from the *arana* documents, however, is far from definitive. However likely the translation of the key term, until further confirmation in Hurrian lexicography, it must remain speculative. Moreover, nowhere in the texts is Mittani actually specified as the recipient of the payment, so even if the term is correctly understood as Hurrian, it does not necessarily follow that Hurrians are responsible for imposing the obligation. It should also not escape attention that, in the case that the *arana* documents do indicate payment of tribute to Mittani, they offer a novel image of Hurrian overlordship, since collection of tribute is not a known aspect of Mittanian hegemony elsewhere.¹⁷ But this lack of comparable evidence may simply be the result of a known

¹⁴ In Arnaud’s assessment, the tribute would have been paid to Karkamiš, though this notion is based on a later dating of the documents in question. Cf. Daniel Arnaud, *Textes syriens de l’âge du bronze récent* (AuOrS 1; Barcelona: Editorial Ausa, 1991), 16.

¹⁵ Aaron Skaist, “A Hurrian Term at Emar” in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 10/2* (ed. David Owen and Gernot Wilhelm; SCCNH 9; Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 1998), 169-171. Skaist notes also the known Hurrian term *irana*, “gift.” Skaist’s position has been accepted by a number of subsequent scholars, for which see Richter, *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*, 43. Highlighting the uncertainty of the discussion, Fleming raised the possibility that the term is a West Semitic form that is cognate with Akkadian *arnu*, “offense, punishment” (*Time at Emar*, 25).

¹⁶ On the activities of the First Royal House, see pages 297-310.

¹⁷ Donald Wiseman has speculated that AIT 395, a list of large quantities of silver from several GNs, may have been a tribute payment to Mittani (*The Alalakh Tablets*, 104). The document bears the seal impression of Idrimi. My thanks to Jacob Lauinger for calling my attention to this text.

inconsistency in Mittani's management of its territories. Because it employed diverse administrative policies throughout its sphere of influence, it is possible that Mittanian foreign policy was developed *ad hoc* and that it assessed a loose grip on Emar exercised through the extraction of tribute to be sufficient.¹⁸ But these speculations only highlight the need for confirmation of Emar's status in relation to Mittani in addition to the *arana* documents.

A clearer suggestion of Emar's subjugation to Mittani comes not from any text from or about Emar, at all, but rather from the archives of Hattuša. The historical prologue of the treaty between Muršili II and Talmi-Šarruma, king of Aleppo, (CTH 75) offers a brief sketch of relations between Hatti and Aleppo, including an instance around the time of Tudhaliya I in which the king of Aleppo "committed a sin against the king of Ḫanigalbat [= Mittani]" (line 19).¹⁹ Consequently, the king of Mittani granted a petition by the "citizens of Aštata and citizens of Nuḫašše" to acquire territories that had belonged to rebellious Aleppo.²⁰ That Aštata would be in a position to make a favorable request from Mittani involving the redistribution of territory, leaves little doubt that Aštata is represented in this text as having an amicable relationship with Mittani. It is difficult to

¹⁸ For the diversity in modes of Mittani's administration in the Syrian states, see von Dassow, "Levantine Politics under Mittanian Hegemony."

¹⁹ Curiously, the text adds a seemingly anachronistic statement that the king of Aleppo also committed a sin against Hattušili I of Hatti (line 20). For the suggestion that the text records two parallel cases of rebellion and consequent redistribution of lands by two different overlords (first Mittani and later Hatti), see Daria Gromova, "The Historical Preamble of the Talmi-Šarruma Treaty (CTH 75) and Some Chronological Problems of the History of Halap" in *Time and History in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona 26-30 July 2010* (ed. L. Feliu et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 104-105.

²⁰ Nuḫašše included territory south of Aleppo, between the Euphrates and Orontes. Several EA letters mention a king of Nuḫašše, though EA 169 talks of "kings of Nuḫašše," which might indicate that the region was an affiliated band of individually governed cities. Cf. also EA 51 (written by a king of Nuḫašše), which uses the phrase "a king in Nuḫašše," holding open the possibility that there were others. As the immediate southerly and easterly neighbors of Aleppo's territory, respectively, Nuḫašše and Aštata were in a convenient position to expand their control into Aleppo's land.

imagine that Mittani would have given away lands under its control unless the transfer involved no net change in territory and resources from the the imperial perspective. This would indicate that Aštata/Emar, like Aleppo, existed in some state of subordination to Mittani, making the shifting of assets to the stable control of Emar no loss for the broader domain of Mittani, however it was constituted.

It must be borne in mind that the prologues of Hittite treaties, valuable though they are as historical sources, offer a one-sided, apologetic narrative to justify the unequal relationship between the parties. The historical accuracy must be viewed with skepticism.²¹ At most, the data discussed above reflects the fact that a narrative including Emar's submission to a Mittanian administration as early as the beginning of the fourteenth century would have been a plausible view of history to a late 14th century Syrian audience. This goes no distance toward confirming the proposition that Hurrian rule was still in effect at Emar until the time of Šuppiluliuma's conquests (c. 1330). So the Talmi-Šarruma treaty really offers only a glimpse of Emar under Mittanian rule at a very early date at which even Mittani's ability to obtain and administer a territorial empire would be in question.

In sum, we are left to judge Emar's incorporation into the empire of Mittani based on the plausibility of the proposition. We know that Mittani controlled and/or influenced some Syrian territories prior to the third quarter of the fourteenth century. We might be inclined to believe that Mittani played a role in determining the territorial extent of Emar at a very early date. We can observe the earliest documented Emarite kings gathering tribute to pay to a higher authority, perhaps using a Hurrian term to designate the

²¹ For a caution concerning the prologue of the text in question here, see Nadav Na'aman, "The Historical Introduction to the Aleppo Treaty Reconsidered," *JCS* 32 (1980), 34-42.

remittance. From these data it is reasonable to infer that Emar was under some, probably loose form of Mittanian hegemony in the earliest period of Emar's archival range, though confirmation of this claim would require an augmentation of the evidence.²² Whatever power Mittani did hold in Emar would certainly not have outlasted the Hittite invasions into North Syria and Mittani led by Šuppiluliuma I, so by c. 1330 the question of Mittanian domination outside of its own heartland is no longer at stake.

Local Politics of Emar: The Conventional Format Documentation

It is now well documented that Emar had deep roots in the Middle Euphrates tradition of collective governance, which persisted there probably until the end of the city's existence.²³ A consequence of this governing tradition seems to have been that Emar's king typically held only modest power. It is possible that, earlier in the millennium, Emar had no king at all, making the establishment of a monarchy—if that word would even apply in its earliest stages—a very late innovation there.²⁴ From the beginning of the documented period of Emar, however, some type of heritable office of administrative priority—the First Royal House—was already in place and could definitively be called a “kingship” at least by the rule of its third member, Li'mi-šarra, in the latter half of the 14th century.²⁵

²² The Hurrian textual material at Emar does not speak to the presence or influence of Mitanni at Emar in the 14th century, nor would we expect it to do so. The nature of the material is mostly divinatory. Its use at Emar stands in the broader spread of Hurrian trends in ritual and divinatory practices in LBA. It would also be surprising if this material, preserved in the Diviner's archive, derived from the 14th century. For the newly published Hurrian texts, see Mirjo Salvini, *Les textes hourrites de Meskéné/Emar. Vol. I.*

²³ See Daniel Fleming, *Democracy's Ancient Ancestors*.

²⁴ So Jean-Marie Durand, “La cité-état d'Imâr à l'époque des rois de Mari” in *M.A.R.I.* 6 (Paris: ERC, 1990) 39-92.

²⁵ It should be noted that there is not unanimity concerning the status of what I've called the “First Royal House” as kings. Yamada has attempted to counter each piece of evidence for the royalty of this family, maintaining instead that they were “probably one of the leading families in Emar, which was closely

Even after the establishment of the kingship, whenever it may have occurred, the role of the collective stayed strong. Governance at Emar was collaborative, with the monarch's power checked by the ever-present council of elders, the institution associated with the city god ^dNIN.URTA, and the order of the "Brothers." But the kingship of Emar and its prominence among the city institutions underwent some development in the period that the archives span. A paramount concern of this discussion is to understand the development of Emar's governing bodies in order to assess the political changes that occurred in the wake of Hittite interference in Emar. Thus, it is necessary to characterize the local administration of Emar prior to the Hittite intervention.

Only the very earliest documents from Emar stem from a period that is prior to the Hittite conquest, but the dates of those texts are difficult to estimate. Aaron Skaist placed the earliest ruler of the First Royal House, Ir'ib-Ba'lu, at the beginning of the 14th century, and with him the earliest Conventional format documentation at Emar.²⁶ He arrived at this date based on the assumption that the transition from the First to the Second Royal House was initiated directly by Šuppiluliuma I at the time of his Syrian conquests, when he would have deposed Zū-Ba'la of the First Royal House in favor of installing Yaši-Dagan, the founder of the Second Royal House. Allowing around seventy-

associated with the urban authority" ["The Chronology of the Emar Texts Reassessed," *Orient* 48 (2013): 128]. But his arguments about this House falling short of the monarchy go hand in hand with his denial that the texts in which they appear date to an earlier period than those of the Second Royal House. These arguments ignore, rather than contend with, the recent progress of the chronological debate, and cannot be sustained.

²⁶ The recognition of a "dynasty" of Emarite leaders existing mostly prior to the Ba'lu-kabar royal family, which dominated for most of the life of the monarchy in the 13th century, was a product of work by Aaron Skaist, "The Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar." The first "dynasty" of leaders were not in the habit of brandishing about the title of "king," though at least one text, Fs Kutscher 6, makes clear that Li'mi-Šarra, the third figure to lead this family, was, in fact, considered a king.

five years for the four generations of kings who preceded Zū-Ba‘la yields a date of c. 1400 for the reign of Ir’ib-Ba‘lu.²⁷

The shortcoming of this estimation is that it does not recognize the evident overlap of the last two rulers of the First Royal House with the beginning of the Second, as was noticed first by Francesco Di Filippo. Consequently, if the attribution of the new royal house’s rise to the time of Šuppiluliuma’s conquest is to be maintained, then the dates of the rulers of the First Royal House must be lowered by two generations, which would place Ir’ib-Ba‘lu near the middle of the 14th century. This means also that the transitional period would have initiated under Li’mi-šarra rather than his grandson, Zū-Ba‘la.²⁸

More recently, Yoram Cohen and Lorenzo D’Alfonso have again pushed Ir’ib-Ba‘lu’s date back to the turn of the 14th century, while still attempting to account for the overlap between the First and Second Royal Houses. They base their assessment on a chronological link between the Second Royal House king Elli and the diviner Ba‘lu-qarrād, which they place around 1260.²⁹ From there, they count back five generations (estimating an average twenty-five year duration of each) of dynastic rule—three from the First and two from the Second, considering the overlap—to place Ir’ib-Ba‘lu’s rule around 1385.

The problem with this picture is that it is based on a dating of the synchronization of Elli and Ba‘lu-qarrād that is much too early, assuming that Ba‘lu-qarrād assumed his

²⁷ Skaist, “Chronology,” 64.

²⁸ Francesco Di Filippo, “Notes on the Chronology of Emar Legal Tablets,” 198.

²⁹ Yoram Cohen and Lorenzo D’Alfonso, “The Duration of the Emar Archives and the Relative and Absolute Chronology of the City,” in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference* (ed. Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo d’Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen; AOAT 349; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 16-19.

office almost immediately after his father, Zū-Ba‘la made out his will (securely datable to c. 1265) and that Ba‘lu-qarrād cannot have been synchronous with Elli’s father, Pilsu-Dagan, making Elli’s reign quite early. As Daniel Fleming and Sophie Démare-Lafont have criticized, neither of these assumptions is necessary.³⁰ If the dating of these figures is appropriately lowered, then the onset of Conventional Format documentation yet again requires retreat closer to the middle of the 14th century. If the image of tribute payment to Mittani under the rulers of the First Royal House is to be maintained, then the last king to execute such a payment, Li’mi-šarra, must still have acceded prior to c. 1330, when Šuppiluliuma conquered north Syria. Since no further mention of *arana* occurs after Li’mi-šarra, the discontinuation of Hurrian imposition and the arrival of the Hittites are likely to have occurred prior to the overlapping period of the First and Second Royal Houses.

Therefore all documents that are datable to the first two generations of the First Royal House, under the ruler Iri’b-Ba‘lu and his sons, Igmil-Dagan and Li’mi-šarra, can be understood as reflecting a period in the city’s history that is prior to the influence of the Hittites. But they do not constitute the full extent of available evidence for Emar’s pre-Hittite institutions. Because of the unique division of Emarite documentation into the Conventional and Free Formats, the entire body of Conventional Format documentation provides evidence for the political structures of the city prior to imperial influence, even as many of the texts in that format were written in the Hittite period. This is possible

³⁰ For the full critique of Cohen and D’Alfonso’s reliance on the synchronization of Ba‘lu-qarrād and Elli, which they place around 1260, see Sophie Démare-Lafont and Daniel Fleming, “Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams: Cosmopolitanism and Legal Diversity,” *RA* 109 (2015): esp. 53. As Démare-Lafont and Fleming demonstrate, and as will be discussed further below, the revision to Cohen and D’Alfonso’s synchronization has resounding effects throughout the chronological picture of Emar, reaching beyond the present concern of dating the earliest texts.

because Emar's traditional legal institutions, which are recorded in rigidly formulaic types, persisted well into the Hittite period. Thus, all Conventional Format texts, regardless of their date, provide a window into the social, political, and economic world of Emar that existed before the interference of the Hittites. Some very important political changes did, in fact, take place within the social sphere that utilized Conventional Format documentation (see below), but these changes occurred within the institutional framework already established, rather than through deconstructing the system, altogether.

The striking continuity between the pre- and post-Hittite arrival Conventional legal documents, which contributes to the veiling of the precise moment upon which the Hittites appear on the stage, indicates that neither the internal shift in local dynastic rule nor the annexation of Aštata as Hittite territory had a profound enough impact to affect the economy of legal services, the mode of executing contractual sales and agreements, many of which involved the sale of real property by the city, or the scribal format for drafting legal documents in any immediate sense. The lack of reverberation of high-level political changes might reflect an early Hittite policy of non-interference in provincial local government. So long as the province remained stable, there seems to have been no need to intervene.³¹ To be sure, this policy was reversed by the second quarter of the

³¹ Lorenzo D'Alfonso prefers to interpret the absence of a visible Hittite presence in the early phase of Hittite extension into Syria as evidence for an incomplete takeover on the part of the Hittites. In this reading, the Hittite invasion would have swept in and conquered the territory, freeing it from Mittanian rule as a side-effect, but, perhaps because of continued pressures elsewhere in the Syrian campaigns, neglected to install any effective control of the region for yet some decades ["Seeking a Political Space: Thoughts on the Formative Stage of Hittite Administration in Syria," *AoF* 38 (2011): 173-174]. This interpretation corresponds with Cohen and D'Alfonso's preference to read the relationship of the Conventional and Free Format documents as largely sequential. Démare-Lafont and Fleming, on the other hand, preserve a greater overlap between the systems of documentation, understanding the mutual exclusivity of the populations mentioned in each system as part and parcel of the very purpose for the divergence of those systems. That is, they serve different classes of the population. Cf. Démare-Lafont and Fleming, "Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams" and see below.

thirteenth century, when a retinue of Hittite officials were deployed in the greater Emar region. This reversal, as we will see below, was due to changing political pressures in the Middle Euphrates region that required a new approach to oversight in that area.

A discussion of Emarite kingship requires a preliminary word of caution. Although the evaluation of kingship in Emar as a limited office is based on the best available evidence, it must be noted that our vision of the institution is obscured by the lack of anything like a palace archive, or, for that matter, a palace.³² The image of Emarite kingship comes especially through documents assembled in the Building M1 archive, some of which relate to the activities of kings.³³ These documents provide good evidence for coordination of the king with the town authorities and independence from the local arm of foreign authorities, when they come into play. What we lack is anything like an administrative archive for the royal house. The discovery of a palace archive—virtually impossible now due to the submergence of most of the tell under Lake Assad—would have the potential to alter our view of the nature of Emar kingship by giving a greater depth of insight into the administrative activity of the king.

Thus, our ability to view Emar's king as a political actor is curtailed by the nature of the sources. The texts that document the king's activities are primarily economic: testaments of inheritance and land sales. The former shows the king as a legal witness to

³² In Arnaud's publication of the texts, Emar 1-22 are gathered under the heading "Le Palais," with the understanding that these were the remnants of a palace archive. This conception follows the excavator's interpretation of the building in which they were discovered as a *bīt hilani* style palace (Margueron, "Une «*hilāni*» à Emar," 153-176), which, itself, relied at least partially on the texts and the preservation of some royal interests in them to make the identification. There is no compelling reason to believe that the building was, in fact, a palace or that the texts reflect any special royal character. At any rate, the documents in this small cache are of the legal genre and say nothing of palace administration. See further on the issue of (the lack of) Emar's palace in Fleming, "Textual Evidence for a Palace at Late Bronze Emar," 101-109.

³³ For the multifaceted nature of the M1 Collection, see Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 127-299. For the progression of the building's use, see Cohen, *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar*, 54-56.

the wishes of the testator and little more. His role in the latter is the same, but with broader consequences: the king's position seems to be one that is far from the center of the real estate economy.³⁴ In transfers of land, he is not a named party in the contract itself: he appears neither as owner/seller nor as officiator for the transaction.³⁵ Instead, the city institutions, which clearly own and handle the conveyance of real estate, are the contracting parties. As Sophie Démare-Lafont has noted, land ownership may have been directly bound to participation in the local political process, as was the representative system at Ugarit.³⁶ In that case, it is natural that city collectives would play the leading role in land sales, since any changes in ownership would affect the balance of power in the council. The king, for his part, notarizes the contract along with a retinue of other signers, not only serving as legal witness to the transfer but also conferring official approval on behalf of the local land-owning families for the accrual of social power to the purchaser that would accompany the acquisition of land.

The developments that did occur within the Conventional system become apparent as the change in royal houses becomes complete. By the time of Li'mi-šarra, sales of city lands are an entirely standardized procedure, documented in a static layout.³⁷ The property is first confirmed as an entitlement of ^dNIN.URTA—that is, the institution identified by this divine name—and the parties handling the sale are identified as both ^dNIN.URTA and the “Elders of the City (of Emar).” Penalties for claims against the

³⁴ See Daniel Fleming, “A Limited Kingship,” 63.

³⁵ Cf. the many Free Format contracts in which the text begins with a statement claiming that the agreement was concluded in the presence of a named official, e.g. PdA 66; Emar 205, 211.

³⁶ Sophie Démare-Lafont, “The King and the Diviner at Emar” in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference* (ed. Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo d’Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen; AOAT 349; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 209.

³⁷ See Emar 12, 149; AuOrS1 16, 17, 18; RE 22 (a donation, rather than a sale, that still demonstrates the same ownership properties).

property are fixed at two thousand shekels of silver, half of which are paid to ^dNIN.URTA and half to “The City.”

In contrast, AuOr 5 3, a sale of municipal land concluded during the reign of Ir’ib-Ba’lu, the first attested ruler of the First Royal House, evidences a different scheme of ownership and disposal of assets. The institution called ^dNIN.URTA is not at all a party to the sale. Rather, the title is held by “the City of Emar” and the sale is executed by “the City of Emar [and] the Elders of the City of Emar” (lines 3-5), a formula that may simply designate the council of elders as representatives of the city.³⁸ The identification of real property as solely owned by “the City” is a remarkable feature that is discontinued in later sale documents. This change is not simply one of terminology—the separate payments of claim penalties to both ^dNIN.URTA and the City show the institutions are separate entities. So, although the data in this period is severely limited, this text seems to indicate that at the time it was drafted the City was in a position to be the sole proprietor of land.

It is certainly not the case, however, that the position of ^dNIN.URTA as owner of lands was a *de novo* development after the drafting of AuOr 5 3. The payment of claim penalties to ^dNIN.URTA as well as to the city in this document shows that, even within this very transaction, ^dNIN.URTA had a hand in the transfer of real property. Moreover, the slightly earlier archives of Ekalte, just upriver from Emar, demonstrate that the institution of the city god (in that case, Ba’laka) was responsible for the ownership and sale of municipal lands, always in conjunction with the “City of Ekalte.”³⁹ This recalls

³⁸ On the position of the “Elders of the City” with respect to “The City,” see Fijałkowska, *Le droit de la vente à Emar*, 185-95.

³⁹ See MBQ-T 3-11, 48, 61-62, 73-74, and 80.

another sale document dateable to Ir'ib-Ba'lu, AuOrS1 14, which portrays ^dNIN.URTA in the role of joint owner of land with the "City of Emar" (lines 7-8). So, in light of the regional tradition of joint ownership of land between the (institution of) the city god and the City and the ability of the City to own property independently at Emar reflected in AuOr 5 3, the development of ^dNIN.URTA's role as primary owner of municipal lands might be seen as a shift in institutional power within the local tradition.⁴⁰ The transitional process is witnessed during the reign of Igml-Dagan, Iri'b-Ba'lu's successor, at which time documents of joint ownership (ASJ 12 2; Emar 153) give way to those in which ^dNIN.URTA is primary owner (Emar 150, RE 91). This scheme is firmly established by the reign of Igml-Dagan's brother, Li'mi-šarra.⁴¹ Thus we observe the development of a balance of institutional power in the middle of the First Royal House that will persist until the consolidation of royal power by Pilsu-Dagan in the 13th century (see below).

The early documents also provide an ever-so-brief glimpse of kingship in the 14th century. The tradition of collective governance at Emar and other Middle Euphrates sites has rightly been emphasized in the secondary literature; certainly the role of collective bodies such as the Elders and local institutions such as the City is a remarkable feature.⁴² Especially for the time of the First Royal House, the king's role has been viewed as minimal, being described as a *primus inter pares* in the council of elders.⁴³ That may be

⁴⁰ It is far from clear what exactly the nature of an institution named for the city god is or what role it played vis-à-vis the city in both the cases of Emar and Ekalte. The naming of the god and the city as separate owners and the funneling of separate claim payments to each seems to indicate that the two are conceptually separate, but, functionally, it is difficult to know to what degree these complimentary institutions were distinct. In any case, the shift towards the priority of ^dNIN.URTA indicates at least a change in the perception of primary power within the city.

⁴¹ Cf. Emar 12, 149; AuOrS1 16-18.

⁴² See especially Fleming, "A Limited Kingship," 59-71. idem., *Democracy's Ancient Ancestors*, esp. 212-14.

⁴³ Maria Balza, "Witness Lists at Emar. The Syrian Type Tablets" in *Witnessing in the Ancient Near East: i testimoni nella documentazione del Vicino Oriente antico: proceedings of the round table held at the*

true to an extent, considering the otherwise-evident balance of institutional power. The Emarite king was no despot. But we should be careful not to overlook the features that set him apart from the collective institutions. One such striking feature occurs already in a document from Ir'ib-Ba'lu's reign—the very same document that demonstrates the City's potential for joint ownership with ^dNIN.URTA, discussed above—where the claim penalty for a city land sale is set at a thousand shekels of silver each to ^dNIN.URTA, *The City, and the Palace*.⁴⁴ In the first place, this reference to “the palace” implies an institutional apparatus surrounding the king that is significantly enough differentiated from the council—in other words an administrative center. Insofar as it is also the residence of the ruler, “the palace” also suggests at least a modicum of visible wealth, size, and prestige of the place, itself, as compared with other domiciles.⁴⁵ So even if the role of the king as an official was not much elevated over that of councilman, the perceptions engendered by his wealth and status would have likely afforded him an exceptional degree of power.

The second notable inference from the payment of penalty to the palace is the fact that the palace had the power already at this time to require such a clause. The payment of penalties to the palace is a phenomenon associated with the swelling of royal power during the much later reign of Pilsu-Dagan.⁴⁶ In the meantime, the practice seems to have been lost, indicating a check on royal power. The limited data set makes it difficult to

University of Verona, February 15, 2008 (ed. Nicoletta Bellotto and Simonetta Ponchia; Acta Sileni 2; Padova: SARGON, 2009), 79. Cf. also Démare-Lafont, “The King and the Diviner at Emar,” 208.

⁴⁴ AuOrS1 14:31. This text is, in fact, the earliest dateable legal document from the Emar archives.

⁴⁵ Cf. Fleming's expectations of the palace based on considerations of the ritual texts (“Textual Evidence for a Palace, 107).

⁴⁶ Cf. Démare-Lafont, “The King and the Diviner at Emar,” 208. Balza, “Witness Lists at Emar,” 78, 93-94.

ascertain whether a strong palace role was standard for the early period.⁴⁷ If it was, then when Pilsu-Dagan began to expand his power in the 13th century, he might have been reinvigorating the strength of an older institution of kingship rather than innovating a new type of royal prerogative.

Another document records Li'mi-šarra's bestowal of a heritable cultic office on a private citizen in return for his assistance in settling what may be an international dispute with Mittani.⁴⁸ This text, which is also the most explicit reference to a member of the First Royal House holding the title "king" (LUGAL, line 14), shows that the "king of Hurri" held the palace primarily responsible for a debt—perhaps a payment of tribute⁴⁹—going so far as to take four of Li'mi-šarra's own daughters as hostage for default.⁵⁰ A private citizen interceded to satisfy the debt "on behalf of the palace" (*ištu ekalli*).⁵¹ The king's expected role in the of what may be the payment of tribute and his personal responsibility for default places him as the leading party in foreign relations. Even though the local power of the king was minimal in terms of participation in land-sale transactions in the earlier documented phases of the monarchy, a status as head of state in international affairs may have been distinctive to his position.

⁴⁷ It is, of course, possible that the palace is included as a third beneficiary of claim penalties for some reason unique to this transaction and not obvious to the modern reader. Even in such a case, the attestation of the palace as recipient here alongside the city and ^dNIN.URTA is revealing of its power as a center of administration.

⁴⁸ FsKutscher 6.

⁴⁹ For the question of whether Emar ever owed tribute to Mittani, see page 294.

⁵⁰ See Durand and Marti, "Chroniques du moyen-Euphrate 2," 145-49 for a different interpretation of this episode. See also Regine Pruzsinszky, "Bemerkungen zu institutionellen Veränderungen in Emar in der Spätbronzezeit" in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference* (ed. Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo D'Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen; AOAT 349; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 76-77.

⁵¹ See Seminara (*L'accadico di Emar*, 472) for the sense of *ištu* in this phrase.

The rise of the Second Royal House is perhaps the only immediately visible effect of the Hittite conquest. It is possible that the Hittites, themselves, elevated this family directly, but one might expect the installation to be more definitive in such a case. Instead we have overlapping generations of prominence between the two royal houses. It may rather be that the wake of the Hittite conquest created a political climate in which an alternative leadership was able to germinate and, eventually, crowd out the establishment leadership. There is no evidence for hostility between the dynasties—in fact there is some fluidity between members of their administrations.⁵² Since Emar apparently operated with a good deal of independence immediately after the takeover, the city's government may have gone through a corrective process that shifted power away from actors who led the Mittani-supporting administration.

Following the transition of the royal houses, over time, the king's relationship to the land-sale system evolved, as he gradually took on a more independent role in these transactions. The land sales concluded in the time of the First Royal House are sealed by a number of individual witnesses, the full approval of each apparently being required. But by the time of the Second Dynasty, such contracts need only bear the dynastic seal and the seal of ^dNIN.URTA. One interpretation of this development is that the king had begun to acquire more independence and perhaps legitimacy as an institutional power, himself.⁵³

The picture of a gradual increase in royal power, especially at the beginning of the thirteenth century, continues after the completion of the transition to the Second Dynasty.

⁵² Cf. Di Filippo, "Notes on the Chronology of Emar Legal Tablets," 196-98.

⁵³ See Balza, "Witness Lists at Emar," 79-80, following Masamichi Yamada, "The Dynastic Seal and Ninurta's Seal," 59-62.

Several indications point toward a concentration of royal power during the reign of Pilsu-Dagan, the third ruler of the Second Royal House. In the first place, the number of explicit references to Pilsu-Dagan, as well as his son, Elli, as “LUGAL (^{uru}*E-mar^{ki}*)” are dramatically increased in comparison to the scanty uses of that title for previous rulers.⁵⁴ But in addition to the emphasis on a titular distinction, a substantive increase in the king’s economic participation has been recognized. Pilsu-Dagan began to broker land transactions as a contractual party and primary signatory, with no involvement from the city institutions.⁵⁵ That is, he acquired or disposed of his own property assets without the oversight of the city elders or ^dNIN.URTA, listing himself as the primary witness to the transaction. The practice continues as commonplace into the reign of Elli and is also attested for Zū-Aštarti.

Correspondent with the change in sale practice under Pilsu-Dagan is the routing of claim penalties to the palace, rather than to the City and ^dNIN.URTA. As already noted, this is not an entirely new innovation: as early as the time of Irib-Ba’l, there is evidence of the palace receiving penalty payments alongside the city institutions.⁵⁶ Pilsu-Dagan, however, not only revives the palace’s role in the collection of fines—if such a role was ever standard—but inflates it to become the sole beneficiary of penalty funds. Moreover, as Fleming has noted, when land confiscation was necessary due to some

⁵⁴ No Emar king makes his role as king more explicit than Zū-Aštarti, though, for him, the rationale is different. Zū-Aštarti was a usurper who sought legitimization through the reiteration of his official title. His placement within the royal succession has been much debated, but, to my mind, has been settled by Démare-Lafont and Fleming, “Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams,” 65-68.

⁵⁵ Cf. Emar 8, 10, 137; *ASJ* 12 7; CM 13 5. See Démare-Lafont, “The King and the Diviner at Emar,” 210. Pilsu-Dagan may have taken a cue from his father, Ba’l-kabar I, who initiated a single transaction in this manner.

⁵⁶ Cf. AuOrS1 14. Démare-Lafont (crediting Fleming for the observation) is correct that the palace becomes *sole* recipient for the first time under Pilsu-Dagan (“The King and the Diviner at Emar,” 209), but the claim that Pilsu-Dagan is the first to direct such fees to the palace seems to overlook this early text.

criminality on the part of an owner, whereas older documents describe the owner's crime as an offense against "his lord and Emar," texts from the later monarchical period modify the expression to note an offense only against "his lord," even as the tradition of holding land in the name of the city god is maintained.⁵⁷ Here, also, we see growth in the importance of the monarchy.

The sheer number of documents attesting to the involvement of Pilsu-Dagan and his successors in sale transactions has also been raised in support of a swelling monarchy. More than a third of the Conventional style sale documents bears the witness of Pilsu-Dagan or his successors. Maria Balza has looked to this preponderance of documentation involving these kings as evidence for an increased presence of the king in daily life, underscoring the swell in royal power around the time of Pilsu-Dagan.⁵⁸ However, we must not forget that archives such as that of building M₁ favor texts of later authorship. That is, the most extensively preserved documentation will naturally be that which was composed closest to the end of the archive, whereas earlier texts will have been whittled out during the span of the archive's active use. In fact, the statistical distribution of Conventional documentation among the kings of Emar, in general, demonstrates the expected decline in texts related to a given king the more ancient the king's date.⁵⁹ Inference of power from number of documents mentioning the king, in the case of Emar, is inconclusive, but, on the other hand, the structural changes in the king's favor attested in the legal texts point towards an Emarite kingship that was strengthening its power in

⁵⁷ Daniel Fleming, "Schloen's Patrimonial Pyramid: Explaining Bronze Age Society" *BASOR* 328 (2002): 78.

⁵⁸ Maria Balza, "Witness Lists at Emar," 86-87.

⁵⁹ Cf. Di Filippo, "Notes on the Chronology of Emar Legal Tablets," 211.

relation to the traditional city institutions that, until then, had been the primary executors of control.

Even as the Conventional Format documents present a somewhat static picture of Emarite law and economy throughout the span of the system, small adaptations in those documents hint at political changes ongoing in that period. Prior to the Hittite period, some fluctuations in the balance of local power seem to have occurred, such as the circumscription of the king's role in land sale situations and the (perhaps related) rise of ^dNIN.URTA as a permanent fixture in the municipal real estate market, but the data set is too limited to draw firm conclusions about institutional change. The Second Royal House emerged and eventually crowded out its predecessor and, most importantly, by the time of Pilsu-Dagan, the powers of the king began to increase. Otherwise, institutions such as The City and the "Brothers," who are invoked typically in private land transactions seem to occupy a continuous place in the city administration. Notable also is the fact that the transition into Hittite control does not correspond with the major shifts in scribalism and the divergent social worlds that each represent—these developments occur somewhat later. So while Emarite society will undergo significant transformation (see further, below), the fulcrum of those changes is not the transition from Mittani to Hittite domination, which seems not to have been a momentous event in terms of local politics, so far as is reflected in the archives. Nonetheless, it is this transfer of power that sets the stage for the power relations that will come to characterize the city's politics, and so it is to that transition, itself, that we now turn.

The Hittite Conquest of North Syria

To facilitate a contextual discussion of Emar in the Hittite period, we should briefly rehearse the history of the Hittites in Syria. At the outset of the Hittite New Kingdom, beginning with Tudhaliya I, the nascent Hittite empire was dominating or actively vying for control of contiguous lands in Anatolia such as Kizzuwatna.⁶⁰ But the empire was modest and, at this time, consumed mostly with regional, Anatolian affairs. This began to change under Tudhaliya III, who managed finally to bring the immediate neighbors of Hatti under Hittite control, setting up his successor, Šuppiluliuma I (c. 1350-22), in a position to expand the interests of the empire more broadly.⁶¹

Within five years of his accession, Šuppiluliuma began to take steps to confront the might of Mittani and wrest away control of North Syria in what is commonly called the “First Syrian War” or, misleadingly, the “One-Year War.”⁶² The *casus belli* was twofold. First, the Hurrian king Tušratta had launched an attack against Nuḥašše, a west-central Syrian kingdom erstwhile under the Mittanian umbrella, where at least some part of the population had recently declared allegiance to Hatti.⁶³ The Hittites were prepared to come to the aid of this newly minted subject. This factor provided a semblance of justification for a Hittite incursion. Secondly, Išuwa, a province just east of Hatti in Anatolia and north of the Hurrian heartland, began to rebel against Hittite rule. Tušratta

⁶⁰ The absolute chronology of Hittite rulers is problematic and presently unable to be expressed with precision. For work towards absolute dating, see Gary Beckman, “Hittite Chronology,” *Akkadica* 119-120 (2000): 19-32; Stefano de Martino, “Some Questions on the Political History and Chronology of the Early Hittite Empire” *AoF* 37 (2010): 186-197.

⁶¹ For the historical reflections on Šuppiluliuma’s rise to power, cf. the “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma” (CTH 40), a composition of his son, Muršili II.

⁶² On the actual duration of the First Syrian War, see Violetta Cordani, “One-year or Five-year War? A Reappraisal of Suppiluliuma’s First Syrian Campaign,” *AoF* 38 (2011): 240-253.

⁶³ CTH 53. Cf. Ernst Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien: die staatsverträge in akkadischer sprache aus dem archiv von Boghazköi* (BoSt 8; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1923; repr. 1970), no. 3:58-59; and, more recently, Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (WAW 7; Atlanta: SBL Press, 1996), 50-54.

had already warned that crossing the Euphrates would be regarded as an act of hostility.⁶⁴ Thus, sending troops to quell the rebellion to the east was a clear signal that the Hittites would not recognize limits to their sovereignty. As a result of the eastern incursion Šuppiluliuma found himself in a strategic position from which to invade Mittani directly from the north. Though Tušratta initially boasted of repelling such an invasion at some point,⁶⁵ Šuppiluliuma managed to invade and sack the Hurrian capital, Waššukkanni, in short order, even if not completely conquering it during this campaign.⁶⁶

With the core of Mittani decimated, Šuppiluliuma marched across Syria, compelling allegiance to the Hittite empire. The itinerary of Hittite expansion in Syria is known primarily from the historical prologue to the treaty between Šuppiluliuma and Šattiwaza of Mittani (CTH 51). According to this document, Šuppiluliuma ventured into Syria directly from the heartland of Mittani, leading an east to west charge in the north. The Syrian states' responses to the Hittite onslaught were mixed. Ugarit, for example, made a calculated, voluntary surrender to the Hittites accepting vassalage status quite early and helping to defeat Syria resisters—an act for which Ugarit was rewarded with favorable treaty terms.⁶⁷ Others resisted aggressively, such as Mukiš (the kingdom ruled from Alalah) and Nuḥašše, which united to form an anti-Hittite coalition.⁶⁸ Still others suffered internally indecisive or partisan foreign policies, such as Niya, whose leader

⁶⁴ As much is recounted in the prologue to the Šattiwaza treaty, CTH 51.

⁶⁵ cf. EA 17, in which Tušratta claims to have destroyed a Hittite invading force and takes the occasion to send gifts of Hittite plunder to the king of Egypt.

⁶⁶ Cf. Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien*, no. 1 and the later reckoning of the episode in the Šattiwaza Treaty (CTH 51). Cf. Amnon Altman, "The Išuwa Affair in the Šattiwaza Treaty (CTH 51: A, obv. 10-24) Reconsidered" *UF* 32 (2000): 11-21.

⁶⁷ Cf. CTH 46 = *PRU* 4 48-52 (RS 17.340, 17.369). Cf. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 30-32 (no. 4).

⁶⁸ Such events are recorded in the historical prologue to the treaty between Šuppiluliuma I and Niqmaddu II of Ugarit (CTH 46). Cf. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 30-32.

apparently sued for peace even as rival factions led the military to war,⁶⁹ and Qatna, where an aspiring usurper, Idanda, may have invited the Hittite conquest of the city in order to depose the reigning king there.⁷⁰ By the close of this first, extended campaign, Šuppiluliuma had managed to take control of most of Syria, as far south as Qadeš, bringing the Hittite empire directly against a border with Egyptian-controlled territory. He showed no interest in pursuing conflict with Egypt, however, and wrote to Akhenaten shortly after his Syrian conquests to propose a relationship of peace between the two great powers.⁷¹

During the Second Syrian War (also known as the Hurrian War), which may in fact have been an extension of the First,⁷² Šuppiluliuma once again focused his attentions on the core of Mittani and, with the help of Hittite sympathizers in the Hurrian court, managed to conquer and subdue the Hurrian state, bringing a definitive end to an independent Mittani.⁷³ By effectuation of a treaty, Šuppiluliuma confirmed the reign of Artatama II, a Hittite collaborator of the Hurrian royal family, over the Hurrian rump state.⁷⁴ The treaty was soon transgressed, when Artatama's successor, Šuttarna III, bowed to pressure and began to align with the strengthening Assyrian state on its eastern border. This led Šuppiluliuma to march into the Hurrian heartland, once again, to install another

⁶⁹ This episode is recounted in §4 of the Šattiwaza treaty, CTH 51.

⁷⁰ Such is the interpretation of Cordani, "One-year or Five-year War?," 245. For the newly published archives of Idanda, king of Qatna, see Thomas Richter, *Das Archiv des Idadda: Die Keilschrifttexte aus den deutsch-syrischen Ausgrabungen 2001-2003 im Königspalast von Qatna* (Qatna-Studien; Wiesbaden; Harrassowitz Verlag, 2014).

⁷¹ This state of peace was soon to unravel, however, owing to the so-called *daḥamunzu* affair, in which Šuppiluliuma's son, Zannanza, was murdered en route to marry the widowed Egyptian queen. This resulted in a proxy war between Hatti and Egypt in Syria, which culminated in the direct confrontation of the great powers at the famed Battle of Qadeš.

⁷² See Violetta Cordani, "Suppiluliuma in Syria after the First Syrian War: The (Non-)Evidence of the Amarna Letters" in *New Results and Questions on the Reign of Suppiluliuma I* (ed. Stefano de Martino and Jared Miller; Firenze: LoGisma, 2013), 44.

⁷³ The Second Syrian War is only known from one text: KUB 19 9 (CTH 83.1).

⁷⁴ Cf. CTH 51 A obv. 1-16.

Hurrian prince, Šattiwaza as vassal king under the terms of a newly drafted treaty (CTH 51).⁷⁵

Where does Emar fit into the scheme of Hittite conquest? The available documentation does not allow the question to be answered with precision. We possess no rich documentation for the history of Hittite-Aštatan relations such as the prologues that appear in the vassal treaties known for some other states. As a territory abutting the Euphrates, bordering directly on Hurrian lands, it seems natural that Šuppiluliuma would have taken it early after his first sack of Waššukanni, as he crossed the river into the Syrian territories. But Šuppiluliuma's treaty with Tette of Nuḥašše indicates that, at the time of Nuḥašše's submission to Ḫatti, probably late in the First Syrian War, Aštata was still considered a hostile region to the Hittites.

[Tette] shall be at peace with my friend and hostile to my enemy. If the King of Hatti goes against the land of Hurri, or Egypt, or Babylonia, or the land of Ashtata, or the land of Alshi—whatever foreign lands are located near your borders and are hostile to the King of Hatti, or whatever lands located near located near your borders which are at peace with the King of Hatti—the land of Mukish, the land of Aleppo, the land of Kinza—and which should turn and become hostile to the King of Hatti—when I, the king of Hatti, go forth to attack, if Tette does not mobilize...he will transgress the oath.⁷⁶

Additional evidence shows the Syrian states were not conquered in a sequential, east to west order. For example, the Upper Euphrates region of Karkamiš, owing, no doubt, to its strength and strategic location, was not taken until some years after the majority of the Syrian kingdoms had already fallen into Hittite hands.⁷⁷ Since Mittani was not yet fully dismantled at the time of the First Syrian War, it is conceivable, for instance,

⁷⁵ For a fuller historical narrative, see Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 160-63.

⁷⁶ CTH 53 A ii 6-32, following the translation of Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 51.

⁷⁷ Cf. KUB 19 9 (CTH 83.1); Jacques Freu, *Histoire du Mitanni* (Collection Kubaba. Série Antiquité 3; Paris: L'Harmattan, 2003), 148.

that Aštata's proximity to the Hurrian heartland would have made it a riskier target for an early conquest. But more than just geography may factor into the rationale for the Hittite battle plan in Syria. The Syrian kingdoms had a history of independence and, once free of Mittanian hegemony, likely would have attempted to revert to their traditional forms of governance. Every independent kingdom would have presented unique challenges to the invading Hittites, who would have responded to each based on a prioritized threat assessment. Whatever the timeframe for the Hittite arrival in Emar, it is clear that by the time of the installation of Šattiwaza on the throne of the remnant state of Mittani, Aštata was held fast enough by the Hittites to assign it to the jurisdiction of the Hittite viceroy of Karkamiš.⁷⁸

The Role of Hittite Karkamiš in Emar Politics: Evidence of the Free Format Documentation

Immediately following the conquest, two bastions of Hittite presence in the Syrian territories can be identified. Aleppo was captured early in the first wave of Hittite attacks. The historical and religious prestige of this city made it a symbolic focus for Hittite control. Rather than subordinating its native ruler as a vassal, as was the normal mode of governance in Hittite Syria, Šuppiluliuma installed his son, Telepinu, as king of Aleppo and perhaps, in a measure, as a viceroy in western Syria, though this role is ill-attested in the sources.⁷⁹ Owing to the religious importance of Aleppo, the traditional seat of the

⁷⁸ Cf. CTH 51 A rev. 14-21.

⁷⁹ Horst Klengel has argued that the vicereignty of Syria was intended, from the beginning, to be administered through Karkamiš; Aleppo was always meant for a different (religious) role. "Einige Bemerkungen zur hethitischen Herrschaftsordnung in Syrien" in *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie: Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999* (ed. Gernot Wilhelm; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 261, 266. D'Alfonso has contended that Karkamiš was originally assigned a high position in the empire, but later had its power curtailed. Only in the second quarter of the 13th century did it gain the position of vicereignty, in earnest ("Seeking a Political Space," 173-174).

storm god, Telepinu's role there is described in religious terminology: he is referred to as "the Priest" (SANGA).⁸⁰

Early on, the great king of Hatti utilized Aleppo to serve as intermediary between the Syrian states and the Hittite court. A dictate of Muršili II makes especially clear the role of mediation envisioned: "But if some judicial matter (arises), the Priest⁸¹ shall mediate for you^(pl.) in (those) judicial matters, and he shall question you^(pl.) (concerning) the judicial matters. But if some judicial matter becomes (too) grave and you^(pl.) are not able to handle it, then you shall refer it here to My Majesty, and My Majesty will handle it."⁸² Karkamiš is also addressed in this same royal dictate, but it appears that the role of mediator is specifically reserved for the king of Aleppo. Hence, in the earliest phases of Hittite rule in Syria (late 14th century), Aleppo was intended to play an active role in governance, either instead of or in addition to Karkamiš. But rather than being an invention based on explicit trust, this very same edict intimates that this role arose as a consequence of Aleppo and Karkamiš overstepping their powers.⁸³ So as much as playing the role of judicial intermediary for Hatti required an investment of power in the Hittite-controlled cities, it also served to bring them under a well-defined power-structure that curtailed their sovereignty.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ See further, Lorenzo D'Alfonso, "Talmi-šarruma Judge? Some Thoughts on the Jurisdiction of the Kings of Aleppo during the Hittite Empire" *SMEA* 40 (2007): 159-69.

⁸¹ Either Telepinu or Talmi-šarruma at this point.

⁸² KBo 3.3++ (CTH 63.2) iii 53-59. Translation after Jared Miller, "Mursili II's Dictate to Tuppi-Teššub's Syrian Antagonists," *Kaskal* 4 (2007): 130.

⁸³ KBo 3.3++ (CTH 63.2) iii 26'-36'.

⁸⁴ Note also that both Telepinu in Aleppo and Šarri-Kušuh in Karkamiš were subject to vassal treaties like the other provinces, though, admittedly, they stand out as exceptional due to the privileged status of the contracting parties. On the treaties with Aleppo and Karkemiš, see Lorenzo D'Alfonso, "Die hethitische Vertragstradition in Syrien (14.-12. Jh. v. Chr.)" in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. (BZAW 365; Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2006), 321.

But the Syrian viceroyalty seems to have developed in unexpected ways during the empire period. Despite its exalted place in the territories, Aleppo does not factor prominently into the administration of Syria as reflected by the available sources. It seems not to have lasted as a regional power for long. The enduring seat of Hittite power in Syria was, rather, located at the city of Karkamiš, located far north on the Euphrates on the cusp of Anatolian lands. The strategic and defensible location of Karkamiš had helped it to resist takeover by the Hittites during the first wave of Syrian conquests by Šuppiluliuma. It was not until the Second Syrian war, when attention was fixed upon the final defeat of Mittani, that Karkamiš, then still a Hurrian stronghold, was conquered as the result of an eight-day siege, which Muṣili II would later describe as a spectacular battle.⁸⁵

It seems that, from the beginning, Karkamiš was not intended to be incorporated into the empire in the normal mode of vassalage. From the moment of its capture, Šuppiluliuma installed another of his sons, Piyašili, who would take the throne name Šarri-Kušuh, as ruler of Karkamiš, making him “a king in his own right” (*na-an-ḫa-an-ti LUGAL-un i-ja-at*).⁸⁶ Perhaps, like Aleppo, the prestige of Karkamiš made it more fitting to be ruled by a proper Hittite royal, though the strength of its position, which the Hittites now knew all too well, may also have made it too much of a risk to leave in the hands of a local ruler. Whatever the reason for this strategic decision, the installation of a Hittite prince on the throne of such a powerful Syrian territory was an exceptional intervention in regional politics with equally radical repercussions in the long-term development of Syria under the Hittite empire.

⁸⁵ “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma” (CTH 40) tablet 7, KBo 5. A iii 26ff.

⁸⁶ “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma” (CTH 40) tablet 7, KBo 5. A iii 20.

It is clear that the king of Karkamiš enjoyed an exceptional status among the rulers of imperial territories since nearly the beginning of Hittite incursion into Syria. A royal edict of Muṣili II shows that Šarri-Kušuḫ and his successors follow in rank only the Great King, himself, and his designated heir.⁸⁷ The edict is a concession aimed at placating Šarri-Kušuḫ, who was, after all, Muṣili's elder brother, and whose power was, at the time, more stable than Muṣili's own. Muṣili understood the threat presented by his royal siblings and engendered their support through conciliatory gestures.⁸⁸ This kind of official recognition of the powers of a subsidiary ruler recalls the later treaty between Tudhaliya IV and Kurunta, who was installed as king of Tarhuntašša.⁸⁹ In both cases, a concession of power is made in the face of a perceived threat to the throne of Hattuša. But just as the nod to Kurunta's power does not indicate that he played any official, viceregal role in the Hittite apparatus, neither does Muṣili II's edict regarding Karkamiš provide direct evidence for an early establishment of the Karkamiš viceroyalty.⁹⁰ It does, however, demonstrate the strength of Karkamiš within the Hittite power nexus already early on, which put it in a position to attain the viceroyalty soon thereafter.

There is scant evidence for Karkamiš's role in Syrian affairs under Šarri-Kušuḫ, though one text from Ugarit shows that ruler's interest in larger matters Syrian. The text proposes a military alliance between Karkamiš and Ugarit against Nuḫašše.⁹¹ It does not clearly demonstrate that Karkamiš held any official position over Ugarit, but Šarri-Kušuḫ presents himself with authority, even if not based on a codified authority. He defines

⁸⁷ CTH 57 (KBo 1 28).

⁸⁸ See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 154.

⁸⁹ CTH 106. Cf. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 102-117.

⁹⁰ *contra* Klengel, "Einige Bemerkungen zur hethitischen Herrschaftsordnung in Syrien," 261.

⁹¹ PRU 4 54-55 (RS 17.334).

himself in the letter only as “the king,” apparently needing no further qualification and perhaps indicating that Šarri-Kušuh perceived himself to be Niqmadu’s superior. Šarri-Kušuh offers Niqmadu the opportunity to retain any and all plunder and captives taken in the course of battling Nuḥašše, rendering nothing to Karkamiš, should he agree to invade on the side of Karkamiš. The offer carries the implication that without such a dispensation Niqmadu would normally have been expected to pay a portion to Karkamiš, which would indicate a hierarchical relationship between the regions. This text is illuminating in that it demonstrates that, even if not based on an official hierarchical position, Karkamiš already in the early days of the Hittite period exercised a *de facto* power in Syria, perhaps thanks in part to the privileges of its sitting Hittite king conferred by the Great King. Karkamiš was strong early on and likely would not have struggled to develop its official status within the empire at an early date.⁹²

But despite the early strength of Karkamiš and despite the fact that Emar documentation is continuous from as early as the Mittanian period until the end of the city, there is a complete lack of textual data from Emar attesting to Hittite administrative officers or their activities for roughly half a century from the time of the Hittite conquest.⁹³ The name of Šarri-Kušuh is attested in Emar only in genealogical patronymics.⁹⁴ It is only late in the reign of his successor, Šaḫurunuwa, that evidence of

⁹² Cohen and D’Alfonso’s mostly sequential understanding of the chronology of the Free Format and Conventional scribal systems is predicated historically on the idea that Karkamiš would have intervened in Emar earlier, were it able. A picture of a weaker Karkamiš early on offers a justification for the gap between the Hittite takeover of Syria and the onset of Hittite presence in Emar in the Free Format documents. For them, the power of Karkamiš came in a late swell.

⁹³ Because Conventional Format documents never mention Hittite authorities, another way to make the same observation is to say that Free Format documentation—the only type to contain reference to Hittites—does not begin until half a century after the Hittite conquest. There must be a relationship between the beginning of this type of text production and the growing presence of the Hittites in Emar, which will be considered in more detail below.

⁹⁴ Emar 31, 177, 201, 202; Fs Greenfield 1.

Karkamiš administration at Emar begins to surface—an unexpected gap in Karkamiš presence that demands further consideration (below).

With the beginning of a visible Hittite presence in Emar affairs—correspondent with the rise of Free Format scribalism—a multifaceted picture of Hittite/Karkamiš involvement in Emar emerges. It is likely that the rulers of Emar were subject to a vassal treaty with the Great King of Hatti—or, since Aštata was granted to Karkamiš in the Šattiwaza treaty, with Karkamiš, itself—even though no copies of such an agreement have survived. The use of treaties is a well-known feature of Hittite imperialism, attested for the Syrian kingdoms for Ugarit, Amurru, Nuḥašše, Mittani, and Mukiš.⁹⁵ A reflection of such a document involving Emar may be contained in a single reference to an “oath (*māmītu*) of Emar” that is used by Ini-Teššub to apply judgment in an affair involving unjust enslavement of an Emarite family by Hešmi-Teššub, Ini-Teššub’s brother.⁹⁶ In Hittite treaties written in the Akkadian language, *māmītu* refers to the treaty agreement, itself,⁹⁷ perhaps following Syro-Mesopotamian conventions in the early second millennium that utilized oath formats for the conclusion of international agreements.⁹⁸ More fully, Akkadian *riksu u māmītu* provides a literal counterpart to the Hittite treaty terminology expressed as *išhiul* and *lingai-*, “binding and oath.” Particularly in later

⁹⁵ CTH 46, 66 (Ugarit); CTH 49, 62 (Amurru), CTH 53 (Nuḥašše), CTH 51, 52 (Mittani), and CTH 136 (Mukiš). For the Mukiš treaty, which has not been universally recognized as such due to its fragmentary nature, see Elena Devecchi, “A Fragment of a Treaty with Mukiš,” *SMEA* 49 (2007): 207-16.

⁹⁶ Emar 18:11-12. Cf. also the related document, Emar 19.

⁹⁷ Cf. *PRU* 4 86:5 (RS 17.338); KUB 3 14 (CTH 62). Several examples comes from the roughly contemporary El Amarna archives such as EA 67:13-14, which refers to a party who “made a treaty with the ruler of Byblos” using this same terminology: *ētepuš māmīta itti amili ša Gubli*. Cf. also EA 148:37; 149:60.

⁹⁸ Cf. the Old Assyrian treaty text Kt.00/k 6, which concludes by labeling the text “*māmītum* of the great king of Kaniš.” See further Cahit Günbatti, “Two Treaty Texts Found at Kültepe” in *Assyria and Beyond: Studies presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen* (ed. J.G. Dercksen; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Osten, 2004), 255.

developments of Hittite treaty procedures, loyalty was emphasized, “stressing the oath and by raising the issue of loyalty to the status of principal obligation...”⁹⁹ The “oath of Emar,” emphasizing the most important element of the agreement, seems to refer to Emar’s vassal treaty in shorthand.¹⁰⁰ This particular reference evidences a favorable agreement for the Emarite citizens, whose rights seem to have been protected in this case. Clearly using this situation as an opportunity to promote the advantages of the treaty, Ini-Teššub makes clear that the Emarite parties have benefited from the treaty with Emar.¹⁰¹

It is worth noting that this text refers to the document as the treaty “of Emar” rather than as an agreement between individual persons (the Great King and the vassal king), which is the more common mode of contract in the Hittite empire. Perhaps that moniker is only an abbreviated way to refer to the kings’ treaty.¹⁰² But it is also possible that the treaty was actually concluded with the town—that is, the town’s collective government—rather than the king, if at the moment of the contract the town was perceived to be the appropriate authority with which to negotiate. This would not be out of place for Emar, whose tradition of collective governance continued throughout the existence of the monarchy. There are, in fact, examples of Hittite treaties at various times and places within the empire that are contracted with collectivities rather than

⁹⁹ Jared Miller, *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts* (WAW 33; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 19.

¹⁰⁰ See also Lorenzo D’Alfonso, “Syro-Hittite Administration at Emar: New Considerations on the Basis of a Prosopographic Study” *AoF* 27 (2000): 290-291. Still in LBA Syria, the *māmītu* terminology was in use for agreements concluded among vassal kingdoms, without the interference of the Hittite superior. Such is the case of *PRU* 4 284-86 (RS 19.68), which records the *māmītu* between Aziru of Amurru and Niqmaddu (II) of Ugarit.

¹⁰¹ Emar 18:25. See *Emar VI.3* p. 30 n 25 for the troubled reading of the word *māmītu* (*ma-mi-IA-ti*) in that line, which is also represented in the line drawing. Arnaud later decided the anomalous IA-sign was simply a dialectical feature [Daniel Arnaud, “Contribution de l’onomastique du Moyen-Euphrate à la connaissance de l’Emarite” *SEL* 8 (1991): 27-28] (after D’Alfonso, “Syro-Hittite Administration,” 290 n. 62). MEDA, however, reads the word (*ma-mi-ti*) with no indication of trouble.

¹⁰² If so, then it is unique in referring to the treaty in this way. Other summary references to treaties refer to their conclusion by individuals (e.g. EA 67 13, “He made a treaty *with the man of* Byblos”).

individuals, including the treaties with the Kaska people (CTH 137-140), the treaty with the *ḫapiru* (CTH 27), the treaty with the citizens of Ismerika (CTH 133), the Mita of Puhhuwa text (CTH 146), and the treaty with the elders of Ura (CTH 144). More to the point, the Middle Hittite treaty with Aštata, itself, perhaps dateable to Tudhaliya I, was also concluded with “the people of Aštata” (LÚ^{meš} uru Aš-ta-t[a¹]), suggesting that dealing with the collective government was the appropriate authority through which to draw up treaty documents in Emar.¹⁰³

After a period of non-intervention, when Karkamiš did become active in Emar, Šaḫurunuwa, himself, is portrayed with active involvement in Emarite affairs in two documents.¹⁰⁴ One is a living testament, which was concluded in front of Šaḫurunuwa and bears his royal seal.¹⁰⁵ There is nothing in the text to suggest a reason for the performance of such a quotidian legal service in front of the king of Karkamiš, leaving us to assume either that the contracting party held some connection to Karkamiš (such as an office in Hittite administration) or that the circumstance was an accident of location (i.e. the Karkamiš king was in Emar or the contracting party was in Karkamiš at the time of the need for legal service). The second document confirms inheritance rights for Zū-Ba‘la, the Diviner, whose office qualified him as a member of the Hittite administrative structure.¹⁰⁶ That document was, in fact, drafted after the reign of Šaḫurunuwa, but recalls the previous action of that king in favor of Zū-Ba‘la. His position appears to have

¹⁰³ KBo 50.134 + KUB 57.18 after Alfonso Archi, “Aštata: A Case of Hittite Imperial Religious Policy,” *JANER* 14 (2014): 142. For the text, see Jared Miller, “Joins and Duplicates among the Bogazköy Tablets (11-20),” *ZA* 97 (2007): 127-28.

¹⁰⁴ Several other texts list his name in the patronymic of Ini-Teššub: Emar 177, 202; RE 85; Fs Greenfield 1.

¹⁰⁵ Emar 31. For the seal of Šaḫurunuwa, which is known only from this document, see Dominique Beyer, *Emar IV: Les sceaux* (OBO 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 45-46.

¹⁰⁶ Emar 201. For this important text, see further pages 332-33. For the role of the Diviner within the Hittite apparatus, see page 362.

entitled him to access both to the Karkamiš juridical circuit and, at least in one case, to the Hittite Great King, himself.¹⁰⁷ These two documents hint at the growing presence of Karkamiš as an established, legal authority in the Syrian territories, late in the reign of Šaḫurunuwa.

It is also under Šaḫurunuwa, or very shortly thereafter, that the battery of Hittite officials known to have been active in Emar somewhat later began to be deployed. The earliest of the officials called “Overseer of the Land” at Emar, Puḫi-šenni, is known to have been contemporary with the transition between Šaḫurunuwa and his successor. Puḫi-šenni served as scribe for confirmation of Zū-Ba‘la’s inheritance mentioned above, presumably prior to his elevation in official rank.¹⁰⁸ The earliest of the officials called “DUMU.LUGAL” who was active in Emar, Tuwata-ziti, belongs to the same period.¹⁰⁹ There is no attestation of a Hittite governance operative in Emar until *c.* 1275.

Building upon the policies of his father, the next king of Karkamiš, Ini-Teššub, presided over a systematic involvement of Hittite officials in Emar. Ini-Teššub, himself, is attested in some nine Emar documents,¹¹⁰ with his seal attested on an additional three.¹¹¹ Each deals with legal matters: either the drafting of new legal agreements or royal arbitration. Three of these documents involve matters of economic importance for the Zū-Ba‘la family of diviners. Evidently, their affairs were privileged enough to warrant the sustained attention of the Karkamiš king, even when the matter at stake was

¹⁰⁷ See *SMEA* 45 1, a letter in Hittite from the Great King (perhaps Mursili III/Urhi-Teššub), which intervenes on the part of Zū-Ba‘la.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 112.

¹⁰⁹ This can be determined by his coordination with Puḫi-šenni as witnesses to a living testament Emar 181:18-19.

¹¹⁰ Emar 18, 177, 201, 202; RE 54, 55, 85; Fs Greenfield 1; *SMEA* 30 5.

¹¹¹ Emar 187, 206, 207. Cf. Beyer, *Emar IV*, 45-48, 151.

so pedestrian as the sale of real property.¹¹² Another document derived directly from Ini-Teššub is the declaration of a legal verdict in the affair of Hešmi-Teššub (a DUMU.LUGAL and the brother of Ini-Teššub), in which the latter seized the family of a man who agreed to enter into his service, which, according to the man in servitude, was an overreach of the official's authority. Ini-Teššub agreed, and ordered Hešmi-Teššub to leave the man's family free.¹¹³

In the cases of these four documents, it is clear that the reason for the extension of Karkamiš royal authority was the official status of the parties involved within the administrative structure. It is not surprising that Hešmi-Teššub, a DUMU.LUGAL, was answerable only to the king of Karkamiš with no involvement of local authorities. The special privilege of the diviners is less expected, since the office they hold is not ostensibly judicial or political. Yet the role of this office clearly extended well beyond the sphere of what is traditionally identified with religious practice and seems to have occupied a more fixed place in the Hittite administrative apparatus than is immediately obvious.¹¹⁴

Overall, the appearances of the Karkamiš king in Emar's archives are limited. Instead, an apparatus of official surrogates who were dispatched in the territory figure prominently in the Emar Free Format texts, as they do in documents from Ugarit. One of these was the office called DUMU.LUGAL, which, despite the writing of its name, did

¹¹² Cf. Emar 207, the sale of two houses by Ba'lu-qarrād son of Zū-Ba'la, which is impressed with Ini-Teššub's seal. Evidently, no additional witnesses were required in this case, no doubt owing to the weight of authority carried by Ini-Teššub's royal seal.

¹¹³ Emar 18. The story may not have ended there, however, as, in another document, Emar 19, Hešmi-Teššub claims to have changed his brother's mind and orders the entire family into his service.

¹¹⁴ The nature and role of office of Diviner within the Hittite power structure is considered in detail in chapter 5, page 362ff.

not necessarily imply a filial relationship to a reigning king.¹¹⁵ Although the Hittite offices do not easily conform to a ranked hierarchy, it does appear that the DUMU.LUGAL was, at least, the office of highest prestige. When a DUMU.LUGAL officer witnessed any document, he always occupied the place of first signatory, even when another Hittite official was present.¹¹⁶ Likewise, in some cases where he does not appear as a witness at all, allowing another official to be first signatory, the text nonetheless relates that the procedure was carried out in front of the DUMU.LUGAL, clearly indicating that he was perceived to be the official in charge.¹¹⁷ The holders of the DUMU.LUGAL offices in Syria demonstrably belonged to the court of Karkamiš—that is, they were not functionaries working on behalf of Hattuša but answered directly to the regional viceroy.¹¹⁸ As the most highly respected office beneath the king of Karkamiš, however, the DUMU.LUGAL could be delegated assignments that originated with the Great King after they were passed down the official pipeline.¹¹⁹

The role of the DUMU.LUGAL that is portrayed in the available documentation was largely that of a functionary who lent his official weight to the validation of local legal affairs. Some contracts are introduced with the explicit claim that the procedure

¹¹⁵ Members of this official rank could be related to a king, as is the case of Hešmi-Teššub, Ini-Teššub's brother and therefore a literal son of a king (Šahuruṇuwa). Other holders of the office might also have traced some heritage in the royal court of Karkamiš or in the Hittite court, proper.

¹¹⁶ Cf. PdA 66 14, where the DUMU.LUGAL, Hešmi-Teššub, seals above the Overseer of the Land, Puḫi-Šenni.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Emar 211, which was concluded before the DUMU.LUGAL, Zulanna, but sealed by the Overseer of the Land, Mutri-Teššub.

¹¹⁸ This is made especially clear by PRU 4 103-110 (RS 17.28), which refers to Tili-Šarruma as the DUMU.LUGAL from Karkamiš. This is not to say, however, that the DUMU.LUGAL office was a Syrian innovation. In fact, a multitude of seals bearing that title have been found in Anatolia from the empire period. See Gary Beckman, "Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: The View from Mašat and Emar" in *Atti del II Congresso internazionale di hittitologia* (ed. Onofrio Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri, Clelia Mora; Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore, 1995), 28.

¹¹⁹ Cf. PRU 4 108 (RS 18.114), a matter of international fugitives that was handed down from Hattušili III to the King of Karkamiš, who passed it on to Tili-Šarruma.

occurred in the presence of the DUMU.LUGAL, others list him as a witness or bear his seal. A DUMU.LUGAL is attested as witness for living testaments,¹²⁰ sale of real property,¹²¹ sale of slaves or of individuals into slavery,¹²² and money lending.¹²³ The DUMU.LUGAL could also be called upon to arbitrate legal disputes, such as claims over the misappropriation of goods or ownership of property.¹²⁴ He may also have been seen as an alternate authority to the Overseer of the Land, who might be sought out in the case of dissatisfaction with the official judgment of the Overseer.¹²⁵

There are at least nine DUMU.LUGAL officers attested at Emar in the span of less than a century—a period that is covered by only four kings of Karkamiš.¹²⁶ It is therefore likely that the office was not filled by a sequence of individual practitioners, but rather was conferred upon multiple officers who operated simultaneously.¹²⁷ Two of the individual office holders known from Emar—Hešmi-Teššub and Tili-Šarruma—also appear in archives from Ugarit with equivalent roles. Hence, the DUMU.LUGAL probably did not occupy a stationary outpost but rather served as an ambassador *pro re nata* to the Syrian territories from Karkamiš.¹²⁸ When a DUMU.LUGAL was in residence

¹²⁰ Emar 182, 211; PdA 66.

¹²¹ *ASJ* 12 3; AuOrS1 37(?), 38(?).

¹²² Emar 211.

¹²³ Emar *ASJ* 13 29.

¹²⁴ CM 13 1; *ASJ* 14 47 (= *ASJ* 6 p. 65-67).

¹²⁵ This may be the implication of Emar 262, a letter from an unnamed Overseer of the Land, which reports that two men will be going to the DUMU.LUGAL. The nature of their business with that official is unspecified, but since the Overseer of the Land is apprised of the matter, it might be the case that it involves a case he has previously reviewed.

¹²⁶ There are additional documents that, while not attesting the title or the name of a known office holder, bear seals inscribed with the hieroglyphic sign PRINCE. The owners of these seals may also have held the DUMU.LUGAL office. See AuOrS1 37 and 38. Cf. Beyer, *Emar IV*, 160. There is a single attestation in *Emar VI.3* of a DUMU.LUGAL with the Semitic name Imlik-Dagan who is described as being “of the land of [Hat]ti” (Emar 211:23-24). However, this unexpected Semitic-named Hittite official has been rejected upon close review by Durand and Marti, “Chroniques du Moyen-Euphrate 2,” 160-61.

¹²⁷ Alternately, the designation could have been conferred with a limited term of office.

¹²⁸ Despite their travel agenda, the DUMU.LUGAL officers could hold property in the territories, perhaps used as a domicile for their occasional stays. Cf. Emar 379:9-10, which refers to property in Emar owned by Hešmi-Teššub.

in a particular place, he could assume the role of chief authority for any legal matters that arose.¹²⁹

Another important Hittite functionary was the officer called the Overseer of the Land (^{lu}UGULA.KALAM.MA). This official is attested abundantly in the archives—at least thirty-nine times (all, naturally, in Free Format documents)—and was held by four individuals.¹³⁰ Unlike the DUMU.LUGAL officers, who must have visited subjugated territories only occasionally, the Overseer of the Land appears to have been a local fixture.¹³¹ His office also required a regular schedule of travel, though it was apparently limited to the reaches of the territory in which he was assigned—in this case, the region of greater Emar. His focus was therefore only on Emar and its regional environs, which is reflected in the updates regarding city affairs that he received while out visiting other regional towns.¹³²

The four Overseers of the Land at Emar can be approximately dated. Puḫi-Šenni was contemporary with Hešmi-Teššub, the brother of Ini-Teššub.¹³³ If the Overseer Puḫi-Šenni is the same person described as “chief scribe” (DUB.SAR.MAH) in the important document Emar 201, Ini-Teššub’s confirmation of Zū-Ba‘la’s inheritance rights, then his

¹²⁹ Whenever a DUMU.LUGAL is present in a witness list, he is always first witness.

¹³⁰ Late in the history of Emar, a man named Aḫi-malik assumed the title Overseer of the Land, but seems to have done so independently of the Hittite authority and so is not counted here. Cf. Yoram Cohen, “Aḫi-malik, The Last Overseer in the City of Emar” in *Looking at the Ancient Near East and the Bible through the Same Eyes: Minha LeAhron, A Tribute to Aaron Skaist* (eds. Kathleen Abraham and Joseph Fleishman; Bethesda, Md.: CDL, 2012), 13-23. The accounting of four Overseers rather than five is based on the equation of the Overseer Naḫiya, found only in *ASJ 14 46* with the better attested Laḫeya (Emar 90, 217, 220; AuOrS1 72). For this identification, see Masamichi Yamada, “The Hittite Social Concept of “Free” in Light of the Emar Texts,” 303 n.24. *contra* Beckman, “Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria,” e.g. 36.

¹³¹ One Overseer in particular, Mutri-Teššub, who can be synchronized with the Diviner Ba‘lu-qarrad (cf. Emar 211), left behind a large share of legal documents bearing his name or seal. At least this Overseer seems to have been a mainstay in Emar legal affairs recorded in the Free Format type.

¹³² E.g. Emar 262; AuOrS1 94, 96.

¹³³ Cf. PdA 66 14.

official career was already active in the 1260s.¹³⁴ The prolific Overseer Mutri-Teššub is synchronous with Ba‘lu-qarrād, Zū-Ba‘la’s successor. No other Overseer was active until Laheya, Mutri-Teššub’s son, who can be synchronized with the Diviner Ba‘lu-malik, assumed the role.¹³⁵ The final Overseer to act as an agent of Karkamiš,¹³⁶ Tuwariša, is attested in a single text which can be dated to the time of Bēlu-qarrād, cousin of the Diviner Ba‘lu-malik, son of Ba‘lu-qarrād.¹³⁷ The dating of these officers is not so precise as to preclude some overlap in their terms. Indeed, Laheya and Tuwariša seem to belong to the same generation. But both are ill-attested in the documentation, so it is impossible to say whether they served in the position for long. The general picture that emerges is that the holders of the office were successive, perhaps operating for a lifetime tenure, which may have been cut short in the case of Laheya. These four functionaries occupy roughly the span of three generations of the Zū-Ba‘la family. The Overseer seems to have been the highest permanent Hittite representative in Emar, performing the same functions expected of the local king in the Conventional Format documents or of the DUMU.LUGAL, when one was available: serving as primary witness for legal transactions, arbitrating disputes, sealing testaments, etc.

Michael Heltzer has compared the scope of the Overseer’s responsibilities to those of the *šākin māti* at Ugarit. As regional governors, it is probably true that the two shared a good deal in terms of duties, though the comparison should not imply that the

¹³⁴ For this positive identification, see Skaist, “Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar,” 50.

¹³⁵ It is not clear whether the office was formally heritable; only in this case is the father-son relationship of Overseers made explicit (cf. Emar 217). If Laheya is the same individual called Laiya the DUMU.LUGAL in *Hethitica* 5 46f., then clearly there was mobility in the official ranks.

¹³⁶ The last person to hold this title, Ahī-malik, appears to have used the office as a post from which to govern the city independent of the Hittites. Cf. Cohen, “Ahi-malik, The Last Overseer in the City of Emar,” 13-23.

¹³⁷ *ASJ* 14 45 (seal legend).

offices are part of any traditional, pan-Syrian system, such as Heltzer envisions.¹³⁸ The Overseer is clearly a cog in the Hittite/Karkamiš machine at Emar with a better parallel, as pointed out by Beckman, in the Hittite *BEL MAGDALTI* known from the Anatolian site of Mašat.¹³⁹ In light of the fact that an Overseer of the Land is not attested at Ugarit and that a similar office elsewhere in the Hittite empire is called by a different name, the Overseer of the Land position in Emar may have been a unique rather than a standard feature of Hittite/Karkamiš management. Perhaps the office was developed specifically for the support of Emar for political reasons we will explore, below.

In sum, both the DUMU.LUGAL and the Overseer of the Land perform all the administrative duties in Free Format documents that the local king performs in the Conventional Documents. But they perform their services on behalf of—that is, on the authority of—the King of Karkamiš, rather than on behalf of the Emarite king. Yet they do not supplant the role or authority of the local king, whose operations are contemporaneous from the onset of Karkamiš interference late in the reign of Šaḫurunuwa until the downfall of the local monarchy late in the 13th century.

The Relationship between Local and Foreign Authorities: Chronological Considerations and Political Change

What should be clear from the foregoing review of the political institutions at Emar and is already well-documented in the scholarly literature is that the documents of the Conventional Format scribal system, working especially from legal literature, reflect

¹³⁸ Heltzer claims to prove that the UGULA.KALAM.MA is a local, Emarite official, though he fails to make the case; “The Political Institutions of Ancient Emar as Compared with Contemporary Ugarit,” 219-226.

¹³⁹ Beckman, “Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria,” 23-24.

an altogether distinct institutional structure from what is depicted in the Free Format texts. The local king, the city authority, and ^dNIN.URTA, are the legal authorities of the Conventional documentation, whereas the less monolithic structure of the Free Format texts attests to kings of Karkamiš, Hittite officers, or other untitled individuals as their signatories. There is virtually no overlap between the systems. As a consequence, the Emarite king is never directly attested in Free Format documents and the foreign administration never appears in Conventional documents.¹⁴⁰ The relevant question that arises from this sharp divide in text-types and the mutually exclusive legal structures it reflects is what is the relationship between the local authorities of the Conventional system and the Hittite-affiliated leadership of the Free Format? This question is, first of all, a chronological one, insofar as it is necessary to determine how the scribal systems related to one another, temporally. Second to that, and more important for this historical overview, which is ultimately aimed at contextualizing the writing and performance of Emar's rituals, we may try to understand how the political bodies implicitly connected to the scribal types can be seen to relate to one another. The intention here is to utilize the results of recent investigations into Emarite chronology rather than to make a novel contribution to that enterprise. For this reason, there is no need to recapitulate the details of the arguments about the chronology. I would only briefly review the benchmarks for understanding the archives' dates.

It is well-established that the Free Format documentation lasted until the very collapse of the city, thanks to a single debt notice excavated from a private archive dated

¹⁴⁰ The exception to the exclusivity of governing bodies within their scribal frameworks is the Council of Elders, which, despite its intimate connection with local kingship, also appears in transactions presided over by the Overseer of the Land.

to the second year of the Kassite king Melišihu.¹⁴¹ That date sets the *terminus post quem* for the city's fall at 1187. As Arnaud pointed out, debt notices were normally short-lived; debts were repaid and debt notices destroyed within a limited period of time. The fact that this document survived should indicate that the city collapsed shortly after its composition, which also accords well temporally with the general picture of the end of the Late Bronze Age.

The upper limit for Free Format documents is estimated around 1275, based on two documents that are linked to the Karkamiš court.¹⁴² One of them, Emar 31, is the earliest datable Free Format document, stemming from the reign of Šahurunuwa and so composed between 1309 – c. 1270. The most important chronological touchstone, however, is Emar 201, which contains a historical reference to the confirmation of Zū-Ba'la's inheritance rights by Šahurunuwa. The matter of Zū-Ba'la's property rights engendered some controversy, rising so high as to involve the Hittite Great King, probably Muršili III (Urhi-Teššub),¹⁴³ who wrote the (Hittite language) judgment in favor of Zū-Ba'la recorded in *SMEA* 45 1. The decision is confirmed in the sealed text of Karkamiš, Emar 201, but that document was drafted under the auspices of Ini-Teššub, who had by now succeeded his father Šahurunuwa. The participation of the short-lived king Muršili III in the affair circumscribes his involvement within 1272-1265. That range affirms the image of the event taking place at the cusp of transition on the throne of Karkamiš around 1270. The Emar 201 tablet bears a seal of Ini-Teššub that has been

¹⁴¹ Emar 26. This document was recognized as the best indicator for dating the fall of Emar already by Daniel Arnaud, "Les textes d'Emar et la chronologie de la fin du Bronze récent," *Syria* 52 (1975): 87-92, and has been upheld by all subsequent studies.

¹⁴² For extensive discussion of the earliest Free Format documents, see Lorenzo D'Alfonso, "Syro-Hittite Administration at Emar," 269-95; Cohen and D'Alfonso, "Duration of the Emar Archives," 11-14, 16-19; and, now, Démare-Lafont and Fleming, "Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams," esp. 49-51.

¹⁴³ So Aaron Skaist, "When Did Ini-Tešub Succeed to the Throne of Carchemish?" *UF* 37 (2005): 613-14.

linked to the earliest phase of his reign, suggesting that this text, too, was authored soon after the transition, during the early 1260s.¹⁴⁴

Since the Free Format type demonstrably presents itself in the 1260s, the earlier text of Šahurunuwa, Emar 31, should be seen as authored near the end of his reign, bringing it closer to the known timeframe. So the dateable Free Format texts span a period dating between the mid- 1270s and 1187 B.C.E. It is perhaps notable that the first dateable Free Format documents at Emar are really Karakmiš documents.¹⁴⁵ The growing presence of Karkamiš in Emar and the development of the Free Format—a type of scribalism consistent with that of Karkamiš, itself—are clearly related events.¹⁴⁶

The crucial maneuver for scholars of Emar chronology is linking the dateable presence of Free Format documents to the Conventional system, which betrays no direct reference to persons or events that can be dated in absolute terms. Aligning them depends upon the relative chronologies of the local Emarite kings, on the one hand, and the several generations of Diviners in the Free Format system, on the other. The approximate synchronism of one Diviner with a member of the royal family allows the systems to be linked, but the data remains open to a range of interpretation with dramatic repercussions for the understanding of 13th century Emarite society and politics.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Lorenzo D’Alfonso, “Further Studies on the Ini-Tešub Sealing (Part II: A Prosopographic Approach),” *AoF* 28 (2001): 267-75.

¹⁴⁵ To be sure, these documents are dateable precisely *because* they are from Karkamiš and so contain features in their contents that can be linked to history known to us in absolute dates. It is still possible that other, un-dateable Free Format texts local to Emar were composed earlier than the proposed dates of the system, though this would be presently unprovable and would not represent the strongest interpretation of the available data.

¹⁴⁶ This is not to say that the Free Format is a particularly Hittite type of scribalism or was imposed systematically on Emar. To the contrary, the Free Format is a non-system. But even as such, it is one that corresponds to its Karkamiš counterpart. See further on the Free Format, Fleming and Démare-Lafont, “Tablet Terminology at Emar,” 19-26.

Interpreting the chronological synchronisms at their earliest extremes, Cohen and D’Alfonso have constructed a picture of Emar society in which the local monarchy came to an end long before the city was destroyed—perhaps 1250-1240. After this, a Hittite bureaucracy, led by the Overseer of the Land, would have governed Emar directly on behalf of Karkamiš and the empire. For Cohen and D’Alfonso, this encroachment was part of the natural course of progression of the Hittite takeover, which they understand as a lengthy development. The fifty-year gap between the Hittite conquest of Emar (*c.* 1330) and the onset of Free Format documentation in Emar, D’Alfonso posits, is evidence that Karkamiš did not gain full control of Emar immediately.¹⁴⁷ Only after decades of Karkamiš strengthening its own place within the Hittite empire and then exerting its power over Syria was it able to grasp Emar around 1275 and finally to end the monarchy and exercise complete control over the city soon after 1250.¹⁴⁸ This understanding tries to solve the problem of Emar’s distinct scribal streams and the near-complete mutual exclusivity of the persons attested in them by arranging them in a sequential order. The Free Format stream, for Cohen and D’Alfonso, would be an update in Emarite scribalism, gradually replacing the older Conventional system.

¹⁴⁷ D’Alfonso has described the evolution of the role of Karkamiš in the Hittite empire as a three-part process. Shortly after the conquest, Karkamiš held an exceptional and exalted place in the empire, though it was never designated as an administrative center. Soon thereafter, when Muršili II had a confident hold on his throne, he pulled back on his investment in Karkamiš, likely due to the threat of its considerable power. During this period, there would have been no imperial intermediary in Syria, and vassals would have taken their concerns directly to the Great King. D’Alfonso interprets the scarcity of references to Karkamiš in the Syrian cities and in the central archives of Hattuša as indicating a curtailment of its power at this time. Finally, possibly due to imperial reforms under the Muwatalli, Karkamiš regained its powerful status in Syria and placed itself formally within the Hittite administration in Syria. It is only during this period, late in the reign of Šaḫurunwa, that Karkamiš truly assumed the role of Hittite viceroyalty. D’Alfonso, “Seeking a Political Space,” 163-76.

¹⁴⁸ Through his subsequent work, Cohen has continued to push the collapse of the local monarchy earlier and, consequently, to narrow the period of overlap in the scribal systems, though he has not yet made his method for achieving this explicit. Recently, he has characterized the Conventional documents as coming to an end already by 1270 (“Aḫi-malik, The Last Overseer in the City of Emar,” 13).

Sophie Démare-Lafont and Daniel Fleming have recently discussed the problems of this chronology in detail and so I will not divert attention to reviewing those arguments here.¹⁴⁹ I would, however, emphasize the characterization of Hittite presence in Syria implicit in Cohen and D'Alfonso's reconstruction. They seem to take for granted that the ideal exercise of power for the Hittites is a state of complete, direct control over conquered territories. If Karkamiš did not intervene in Emar for fifty years, in this scheme, it was because it could not, not because it chose not to do so. When Karkamiš did become a player in Emar, Cohen and D'Alfonso ultimately envision the implementation of a bureaucratic machine that functions there at the exclusion of the local monarchy. But the evidence does not demand such a heavy-handed Karkamiš presence. Nothing suggests that the Overseer of the Land was a *de facto* king in Emar. His authority seems to be outstripped by the DUMU.LUGAL in many cases, and, moreover, the involvement of each in legal documents is *ad hoc*, rather than systematic. So, while these figures were active representatives of Karkamiš in Emar, no evidence supports the presumption that they constituted a formal and consistent administration. That scenario would be, furthermore, at odds with what is known about the role of Karkamiš in contemporary Ugarit, where the local king continued to rule and manage his own affairs until the end of that city.

Cohen and D'Alfonso's reconstruction highlights what is at stake, politically, in the chronological debate at Emar. Their interpretation of the data at the early extreme has resounding effects for the politics of the region, resulting in the image of a slow-gaining

¹⁴⁹ Démare-Lafont and Fleming, "Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams," 46-49.

but powerful Karkamiš, an Emarite monarchy that failed mid-century, and a formal Hittite administration that governed Emar directly for its last two generations.

Opposing this image is Démare-Lafont and Fleming, whose motivation for reconsidering the relationship of the scribal systems comes not primarily from the chronology (though it is an important component of their hypothesis) but rather from a dissatisfaction with a sequential interpretation. For, even placed in sequence, the social divisions represented by the scribal formats are not adequately explained. There is no continuity of actors from one system to the next, even in patronyms: no person in a Free Format document is the son/daughter of a known person in a Conventional document, as would be expected if a simple stylistic update was undertaken. Moreover, even in Cohen and D'Alfonso's view, there is still a generation-long overlap in the systems' existence that maintains the mutual exclusivity of actors.

These and other dissatisfactions prompt Démare-Lafont and Fleming to undertake also a reassessment of the chronology, which criticizes the extremity of Cohen and D'Alfonso's early interpretation of the same data and proposes, instead, a more moderate chronology that shows the Emarite monarchy to survive much closer to the end of the century, probably collapsing sometime between 1230-1210. The more moderate chronology adds still more reason to treat the scribal formats as synchronous for a significant frame of time.

As a result of dealing with the inevitable synchrony of the documents Démare-Lafont and Fleming propose a model that accounts for the separation maintained by contemporaneous systems: the two scribal formats reflect separate legal systems that applied to distinct portions of the population living in and around Emar. Conventional

documents record the execution of “townsmen’s law,” that is, the legal system available only to full citizens of Emar. Citizenship appears to have entitled individuals to buy and sell city property from the city-god ^dNIN.URTA and to have access to the king and city institutions for transacting other legal affairs. “Shared law,” on the other hand, was recorded in Free Format documents. It served the purposes, broadly, of outsiders dwelling at Emar either temporarily, semi-permanently, or as (alien?) residents. Just as the “freedom” of the “Free Format” suggests for the scribal form of these documents, so too the legal system represented in them was something less than a monolithic administration. There is no single, consistent authority or institution consulted in these texts. They were drafted *ad hoc* with the authentication of whatever authority figure (who was available to the participants, given their non-citizen status) was on hand.

The details of the separate legal systems drawn by Démare-Lafont and Fleming need detain us no further here, as the present concern is to observe the political context of 13th century Emar from the reconstruction. Recognizing the much longer existence of the local monarchy, the coexistence of scribal systems and thus the local king with the Karkamiš authority, is no mere temporary overlap but rather a permanent and intentional way of life. The monarchy remained active in conducting its affairs even as the official presence of Karkamiš representatives was firmly established, as reflected by their participation in shared law. In fact, as the growing presence of Karkamiš in Emar roughly corresponds with the swelling of royal power that especially manifested in the reign of Pilsu-Dagan, it is likely that these developments are linked. Rather than abolishing the local monarchy, Karkamiš, to the contrary, appears to have strengthened it, perhaps in the interest of cultivating cooperation and promoting stability. This suggests a more even-

handed and collaborative image of Karkamiš influence over Emar. In addition to preserving and likely promoting the monarchy, Karkamiš declined to interfere in the affairs of the kings, the city institutions, and the “townsmen” who participated in that system. Karkamiš had no discernable intention to assume a more direct control over Emar, and probably only did so when the stability of Emar was at risk due to internal crisis.¹⁵⁰

It is a non-sequential interpretation that best suits the evidence from Emar itself and what is known, at large, about Hittite preference for collaboration with local kings. The rituals under discussion in this study, in fact, provide additional reinforcement for the (largely) contemporaneous chronological picture of Emar scribal streams. This support will become clear in the following chapter; first, we must address the ultimate question of why, if Cohen and D’Alfonso’s model of Karkamiš’s encroachment is found wanting, did Karkamiš interfere precisely when and how it did.

The question can be answered in a word: Assyria. As soon as the reach of Mittani was curtailed by the Hittites in Syria, the weakened condition of that erstwhile great power east of the Euphrates allowed the Middle Assyrian kings to consolidate their power and expand their borders westward. Already in the late 14th century, the Hittites were paying increased attention to the Middle Euphrates region due to the growing threat of Assyrian incursion. Muršili II recorded in his annals that he dispatched troops to face Assyrian attack already in the second year of his reign.¹⁵¹ In Muršili’s ninth year, perhaps after news spread about the death of Šarri-Kušuḫ, the city of Karkamiš came under siege,

¹⁵⁰ See Démare-Lafont and Fleming, “Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams,” 67-68 and pages 379-83 of this book.

¹⁵¹ KUB 14 16. Cf. Albrecht Goetze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš* (MVAG 38; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1933), 28.

perhaps again by the Assyrians, although the contemporary Assyrian king, Aššur-uballit I, has left no record of the affair.¹⁵² Muršili II personally set out to confront the invaders and successfully reinstalled Šarri-Kušuh's son, Šahurunuwa, forthwith.

But the palpable tension that characterized much of the 13th century relations between Hatti and Assyria emerged somewhat later, during the reign of the ambitious Assyrian king Adad-nirari I (c. 1301-1271). It is this king who began to expand the Assyrian state into an uncomfortable proximity with the Hittite empire through the subjugation of the remnant of Mittani, known to the Assyrians as Hanigalbat. Whereas his predecessor was involved in Hanigalbatean territory only as a support to his ally there against the Hittites, who sought to reestablish some lost control over the territory, Adad-nirari I, once he became engaged with Hanigalbat, aimed to control the region in earnest as an extension of his own kingdom.

Adad-nirari conducted two known campaigns into Hanigalbat. Each is described in his royal inscriptions as a defensive action, occasioned by provocation on the part of the Hanigalbatean rulers. In the first, soon after the turn of the 13th century, Adad-nirari marched against Shattuara I, who is said to have “committed hostilities” against his ostensible ally, Assyria. Since Hanigalbat was in no way subordinate to Assyria at this time, the nature of the perceived offences may have been trivial,¹⁵³ amounting only to an excuse to invade, or, if Shattuara I was privy to Adad-nirari's ambitions, perhaps even represented a preemptive strike.¹⁵⁴ In any case, the Assyrians were successful in their

¹⁵² KBo 4 4:40, following Goetze's conjectural restoration of the broken text in which the enemy would have been identified (*Die Annalen des Muršiliš*, 116).

¹⁵³ Cf. Amir Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat: A Historical Reconstruction of Bilateral Relations from the Middle of the Fourteenth to the End of the Twelfth Centuries B.C.* (TSO 4; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1987), 100.

¹⁵⁴ So Trevor Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, 256.

march against Hanigalbat and, as a result, incorporated it as a tribute-paying vassal kingdom with Shattuara I remaining on the throne.¹⁵⁵

In the late 1280s, however, Shattuara's son, Wasašatta, succeeded his father and incited revolt against Assyria. This development occasioned the second Assyrian campaign against Hanigalbat, which ended with more drastically negative results for the rebels. Adad-nirari claims to have conquered and destroyed many Hanigalbatean cities, including Taidu, the royal seat, and to have done violence to their agricultural resources. After this episode, Adad-nirari no longer entrusted management of the territory to a local vassal and so the region was brought under direct control as an Assyrian province. With this second invasion, the Assyrians could now boast to rule over the former Mittanian state all the way "up to the bank of the Euphrates."¹⁵⁶

The successes of Assyria meant the elimination of Hanigalbat as an important buffer zone between Hittite Syria and the rising power in the east. The geographic itinerary related by Adad-nirari's inscription suggests a domination in Hanigalbat that was focused largely to the north, encompassing the Habur Triangle, the Upper Balikh, and left the Assyrians rapping on the gates of Karkamiš, though they did not seek hostilities with it.¹⁵⁷ Thus, Adad-nirari, for the first time, brought the empires face to face, with the Euphrates region marking their point of contact.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ RIMA 1 A.0.76.3 lines 4-14.

¹⁵⁶ RIMA 1 A.0.76.3 line 41.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 110-11.

¹⁵⁸ There is no longer a consensus regarding the reliability of the Assyrian claims, which derived primarily from royal inscriptions, to have reached the Middle Euphrates in any permanent fashion in the Late Bronze Age. Following a paucity of archaeological evidence in the region to support those claims, some scholars have rather doubted that an established Assyrian presence extended further westward than the Balikh. Cf., e.g., Jaume Llop-Radua, "Did the Assyrians Occupy the Euphrates-elbow in the Middle Assyrian Period (Late Bronze Age)?" in *Broadening Horizons 3. Conference of Young Researchers Working in the Ancient Near East*. Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Servei de Publicacions, 2012), 203-226; Brian Brown, "The Structure and Decline of the Middle Assyrian State: The Role of Autonomous and Nonstate

The enmity that characterized the relationship between the kings of Hatti and Adad-nirari at the time of his expansion is evident in their royal correspondences, which add a level of personal acrimony to the already apparent political tensions. Presumably responding to an earlier request from Adad-nirari for a relationship of “brotherhood”—that is, recognition of equality in royal status—a Hittite king, perhaps Urhi-Teššub,¹⁵⁹ responded with bitter sarcasm,

yea, you now became a great king. But why are you talking about brotherhood...? What is this: brotherhood? ...Wherefore should I write you about brotherhood? Are not friends those who write to each other about brotherhood? For what reason should I write to you about brotherhood? Were perhaps you and I born of the same mother? As [my father] and my father's father did not write to the king of Assyria [about brotherhood], so you are not to write to me about [...] and about great kingship.¹⁶⁰

Somewhat later, Adad-nirari had the occasion to return the barb when the usurper Hattušili III wrote for diplomatic openings. “You are (no more than) a substitute for the Great King,” Adad-nirari reminded him.¹⁶¹

Adad-nirari I's successor, Shalmaneser I (1270-1242), found it necessary to repeat many of his father's exploits in Hanigalbat, due to a renewed rebellion that was likely to have been supported by the Hittites. Whether or not Shalmaneser ever really lost control of the region is unknown, but in reclaiming its loyalty he continued to push the

Actors” *JCS* 65 (2013): 97-126. This has not spelled the end of the position that upholds the early Assyrian presence on the Middle Euphrates, however, and I remain unconvinced of the necessity to doubt the Middle Assyrian extension. Mario Fales, for one, points to sources outside of royal inscriptions as additional evidence for the farther westward reach [Frederick Mario Fales, “Transition: The Assyrians at the Euphrates between the 13th and the 12th Century BC,” in *Empires after the Empire: Anatolia, Syria and Assyria after Suppiluliuma II (ca. 1200/800-700 B.C.)* (ed. Karl Strobel; Collana di studi sulle civiltà dell'Oriente antico 17; Florence: LoGisma, 2011). Cf. also A. Tenu, “Du Tigre à l'Euphrate: la frontière occidentale de l'empire médioassyrien”. *SAAB* 15 (2006): 161-181; J. Nicholas Postgate, “The Debris of Government: Reconstructing the Middle Assyrian State Apparatus from Tablets and Potsherds” *Iraq* 72 (2010): 19-37.

¹⁵⁹ So Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 259.

¹⁶⁰ KUB 23 102 (CTH 171) obv. i 1'-9'. Translation follows Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 77.

¹⁶¹ See Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 276 and 466 n. 49. KBo 8 14 (CTH 216) obv. 10', a letter written by the Egyptian pharaoh in which Adad-nirari's statement is quoted.

boundaries of the Assyrian expansion in the region, claiming the southern extents of Hanigalbat that were apparently left untouched by his predecessor. Shalmaneser's expedition in Hanigalbat was completed by his eighth year, though the consolidation and expansion of his power in the region may have been a more gradual process.¹⁶² In the end, Shalmaneser cast himself as directly controlling the entirety of Hanigalbat with an Assyrian administrative system, including the southern territories that were previously untouched.

Especially important for considering the impact of Assyria on Emar is the case of Tell Fray, a Late Bronze settlement that may well have belonged to the territory of Aštata on the eastern bank of the Euphrates, across from Emar.¹⁶³ In addition to existing within the sphere of Aštata, which, as per the Šattiwaza treaty, fell under the umbrella of Karkamiš, evidence of Tell Fray's relationship to the Hittite empire was found in excavations of the site with the unearthing of clay bullae of Hattušili III and his influential queen, Puduḥepa.¹⁶⁴ But during the Hanigalbatean campaigns of Shalmaneser I, the Assyrians claim not only to have reached the upper Euphrates, but also to have conquered Dur-Katlimmu (Tell Sheikh Hamad) at the confluence of the Habur and Euphrates further south. If Shalmaneser I annexed all the territory east of the Euphrates from its upper reach near Karkamiš all the way to Dur-Katlimmu, then Tell Fray along

¹⁶² For further discussion of the dating of Shalmaneser I in Hanigalbat, see page 289.

¹⁶³ Determining the precise geographic extent of Aštata is difficult, though it is clear from the Šattiwaza treaty that the region encompassed at least some cities to the east of the river. Given the close proximity of Tell Fray to Emar—apparently the most important site in the region—it is difficult to imagine that Tell Fray would not have been one of these adherent cities. For a discussion of the known reaches of Aštata, see Yoram Cohen, "Emar and the Middle Euphrates Valley South of Carchemish," forthcoming in *Hittite Historical Geography* (ed. Mark Weeden).

¹⁶⁴ For the bullae and other inscribed Hittite material from Tell Fray, see Alfonso Archi, "Materiale Epigrafico Ittita da Tell Fray," *SMEA* 22 (1980), 31-34.

the Euphrates' eastern bank would have fallen into Assyrian control.¹⁶⁵ That picture is affirmed by textual evidence outside of boastful royal inscriptions, which shows that Shalmaneser ordered military deployments to Middle Euphrates sites for the purpose of toppling and occupying Hittite fortresses east of the Euphrates.¹⁶⁶ If the still-unpublished cuneiform tablets discovered in the Tell Fray excavations are Middle Assyrian, as they were first identified, then they would serve as a powerful confirmation of the transition in imperial domination of the site.¹⁶⁷ However, more recently, their Middle Assyrian character has been denied, leaving us to await publication for a final assessment of their utility in the political reconstruction of the site's history.¹⁶⁸

The Assyrian capture of a site like Tell Fray, which demonstrably belonged to the realm of Hittite authority, suggests an aggressiveness on the part of the Assyrians not previously witnessed. Such a move adds urgency to the concern for Assyrian expansion in the territory of former Mittani. Facing Shalmaneser I, the Hittite fears of Assyrian encroachment became real, as the empire suffered actual loss of territories along the Euphrates, creating a face-to-face encounter with Assyria along the entire southeastern border of imperial lands.

Even as Assyria stayed, for the most part, at bay across the Euphrates, actual violations of security on a smaller scale do seem to have occurred at border towns on the

¹⁶⁵ Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 175.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Fales, "Transition: The Assyrians at the Euphrates between the 13th and the 12th Century BC," 10 with notes 13-15.

¹⁶⁷ For an assessment of the tablets, see Paolo Matthiae, "Ititi ed Assiri a Tell Fray: Lo Scavo di una città Medio-Siriana sull'Eufate," *SMEA* 22 (1980), 35-51. Though Matthiae envisioned some of the tablets to be dated as early as the 14th century, Harrak has denied that any Assyrian influence is possible at such an early date, opting to place them all in the mid to late-13th century (*Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 176).

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Betina Faist, *Der Fernhandel des assyrischen Reiches zwischen dem 14. und 11. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (AOAT 265; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001), 215 n. 73. Faist cites personal communication from Gernot Wilhelm, who has been newly entrusted with the texts' publication.

Hittite side. Such is reflected in the fragment of an Akkadian letter discovered in Boghazkoy in which the writer, apparently an Assyrian king, defends himself against the accusation of raiding across the border.¹⁶⁹ Another letter from a Hittite king to his Assyrian counterpart complains of raids into the territory of Karkamiš, which, according to the Šattiwaza treaty extends all the way downstream the Euphrates into Emar and beyond.¹⁷⁰ The perpetrators were people of Tuira, a Hanigalbatean city that should have been under the control of Assyria. The impact of this letter is to show that with the rise of Assyria in Hanigalbat, security and stability for the Euphrates border region, including Aštata, was threatened not only by the proximity of the Assyrian machine but also by actual, small scale attacks at the boundary.¹⁷¹

That tensions between Hatti and Assyria continued to grow throughout this period of contact is clear from the known epistolary correspondence between the rulers. But the ultimate expression of the latent hostility erupted at a grand scale with the battle of Nihriya, when the two powers finally confronted one another in all-out war, which was fought in the territory of Hanigalbat. The battle took place in the third quarter of the 13th century, but a precise date remains elusive.¹⁷² Tudhaliya IV led the Hittite advance,

¹⁶⁹ KUB 3 73. Cf. Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 144-45.

¹⁷⁰ KBo 1 14. Published first by Albrecht Goetze, *Kizzuwatna and the Problem of Hittite Geography* (YOS Researches 22; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940), 27. For a re-edition and translation, see Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 69-75.

¹⁷¹ Skaist has even suggested that these raids by people of Tuira could be the very event described in several Emar documents as a siege of the Hurrian troops (AuOrS1 9:21-22; *ASJ* 7:29-30; Emar 42:9-10; cf. Skaist, "Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar," 64-67). Even though neither Emar nor Aštata are mentioned in KBo 1 14, the reference to "the territory of Karkamiš" could well include those regions, since the Šattiwaza treaty assigned Aštata to the dominion of Karkamiš. Skaist dated these raids to the time of Adad-nirari I by context, though the sender and addressee of KBo 1 14 are unclear.

¹⁷² Harrak dated the battle as early as 1258, which represents a minority view (*Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 188). Considering Tudhaliya IV's participation, most prefer to see the conflict as occurring at the beginning of his reign: Gary Beckman suggests c. 1239 {"Hittite Chronology," 26}.

probably facing down Shalmaneser I on the Assyrian side.¹⁷³ The outcome of the battle was decisively in favor of Assyria, marking an acquiescence on the part of the Hittites to Assyrian control in Hanigalbat and reinforcing the importance of the strong border at the Euphrates, since the Assyrians were not to be pushed back. While Assyria never managed to establish a presence across the border into Hittite Syria, the threat of infiltration remained ever-present.¹⁷⁴ The subversive intentions of Assyria are evident in letters to the king of Ugarit post-Nihriya, which promote Assyrian superiority before this Hittite vassal.¹⁷⁵

Undoubtedly, this presented a special situation for Emar, the regional center of the Aštatan territory, which was losing grip of some of its lands to Assyria. The new reality for Emar was to be the frontier of the Hittite realm at its most southeasterly reach, a border city with Assyria far from the heart of the Hittite lands. This unique placement of Emar—vulnerable from the Hittite perspective, though, from the local standpoint, a position of the ultimate leverage—must be ever-carried in mind when considering the Hittites’ relationship to that city. To maintain its territorial integrity west of the Euphrates under constant Assyrian threat, a city like Emar would have enjoyed a special focus from the Hittite authority represented by Karkamiš, which needed to strike a balance between

¹⁷³ The primary source for the Battle of Nihriya, RS 34.165, is broken where the name of the Assyrian king was mentioned. The text preserves “[...]SAG LUGAL KUR” at this point, however, which is very likely to be read “[^{md}šùl-ma-nu]-SAG LUGAL KUR,” “Shalmaneser, the king of the land” (cf. Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 142). It is not impossible, however, that the tablet would have contained a preceding line that may have identified a different king who used “[^{md}šùl-ma-nu]-SAG” as his patronym, namely Tukulti-Ninurta I (1241-1206). For a consideration, see Sylvie Lackenbacher, “Nouveaux documents d’Ugarit: I.—une lettre royale” *RA* 76 (1982): 154-55.

¹⁷⁴ In his royal inscriptions, Tukulti-Ninurta I boasted of deporting 28,800 Hittites from across the Euphrates (*RIMA* 1 A.0.78.23), but he never gained any actual control in the region.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. RS 34.165. Cf. Sylvie Lackenbacher, “Nouveaux documents d’Ugarit I.,” 141-56.

appeasing the city, lest it voluntarily defect to the Assyrian side, and constantly reasserting the empire's claim to superiority over it.¹⁷⁶

Hittite/Karkamiš policy towards Emar must be viewed in this light. It is no coincidence that the Free Format tradition, which first attests to the involvement of Karkamiš in Emarite affairs, appears in Emar in the 1270s, just at the end of Adad-nirari I's reign and closely following his second and more decisive campaign in Hanigalbat, which first brought Assyria into close proximity with Hittite territories. Rather than representing the final stage in a long struggle for Karkamiš to attain real control in Syria, the beginning of Karkamiš's presence in Emar and the rise of the Free Format should represent a deliberate, politically motivated choice. Only at this time, when Adad-nirari had brought the Assyrian threat to the Euphrates, did Karkamiš detect the need to escalate its commitment to Emar. Clearly, however, Šahurunuwa and his son Ini-Teššub understood the delicate approach that Emar's situation required. Rather than intervening with a heavy hand, eradicating the local institutions and traditions, and risking instability, quite the contrary, they intervened with *support* for the local institutions, even allowing the position of local kingship to strengthen, as is evident in this period in the persons of Pilsu-Dagan and his successors, most likely for the sake of creating a stable foundation of support among the leading party of Emar. They deployed officers who, rather than supplanting the roles of local functionaries who administered the legal affairs of townsmen, helped to facilitate juridical efficiency in other sectors of the Emar population,

¹⁷⁶ Klengel began to recognize the early importance of the rise of Assyria when he suggested that a degree of the power of Karkamiš may be attributable to Muršili II's rising focus on the Middle Euphrates region ("Einige Bemerkungen zur hethitischen Herrschaftsordnung in Syrien," 270). This understanding is of a piece with what I am arguing here, though there is no evidence that the strengthening of Hittite presence through Karkamiš in Emar came so early as the reign of Muršili II.

providing their official weight to the affairs of non-citizen residents. Notably, as will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, they appointed the Diviner—a position from which they participated in the management of ritual practice and the administration of cult—again leaving room for the involvement of the local institutions and the local king. Collaboration is the abiding picture of Emar under the Hittite influence of Karkamiš, though, to be sure, this balance was a diplomatic endeavor that Karkamiš held the power to abort. It seems to have done just that when the stability of Emar became threatened by the coup of Zū-Aštarti.¹⁷⁷ Only then did Karkamiš intervene to bring a definitive end to the local monarchy and administer the city directly. As if to prove that the collaborative, rather than direct, approach to Emar was, indeed, the best strategy, not more than a decade or two after the dismantling of the monarchy, Emar did apparently loosen the yoke of Karkamiš and manage itself independently until its final demise.¹⁷⁸

The start of Karkamiš participation in Emarite affairs and the Free Format manner of documentation that develops with it can be seen as related to the growing power of Assyria in the east and its advancement towards the Euphrates under Adad-nirari I. This catalyzed a new era in Emar-Karkamiš relations that lasted until the unraveling of the local monarchy near the end of the 13th century. But Adad-nirari was not yet the most serious threat presented by the Assyrians. His successor, Shalmaneser I, brought the contact of the empires to a new extent, apparently even wresting away some Hittite

¹⁷⁷ The placement of the evidently illegitimate king Zū-Aštarti within the royal succession of Emar has long been an uncertain and much debated issue. Here I follow the most recent and most convincing understanding of his usurpation, offered by Démare-Lafont and Fleming, which places him last in the succession of kings and attributes the collapse of the Emar monarchy to his rule, which seems to have divided the town institutions in such a way that they could no longer work together effectively (“Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams,” 67-68). It is only with this growing instability that Karkamiš had cause to intervene in the local leadership.

¹⁷⁸ See Cohen, “Aḫi-malik, The Last Overseer in the City of Emar,” 13-23.

holdings east of the Euphrates. The urgent threat to stability of the Hittite order that Shalmaneser I presented face-to-face with Emar would have heightened the need for Karkamiš to provide support to and engender loyalty in Emar, lest it add territory west of the Euphrates boundary to its losses. Karkamiš had already put in place a network of official emissaries in Emar. Now it would intervene in subtler ways to ensure the continuing stability of the city as a Hittite realm. The nature of these actions is at the heart of the present study and will be the driving focus of the remainder of this discussion.

CHAPTER 5
POLITICS, POWER, AND THE *ZUKRU* FESTIVAL

The King and the zukru Festival

Because of the coexistence of Emar's monarchy with Karkamiš-led regional governance for two or more generations and because of the political interventions of Karkamiš in Emar that were noted in the last chapter, a renewed focus on the role of the king in the *zukru* festival from a political standpoint is warranted. As already seen through analysis of the festival text, the king is the ultimate benefactor of the *zukru*, donating more than ninety percent of its provisions. It is thus fair to say that, despite the all-inclusive participation in the event, it is the king who truly gives the festival. Therefore, in order most fully to understand the ritual in its political and historical contexts, the interests of the king and the source of his wealth must be scrutinized.

The king is not an unknown participant in Emarite ritual. He is ascribed an active role in several ritual events, which present a need for his physical presence at the ritual. The king was given a banquet table during the installation of the NIN.DINGIR of Ba'lu, where he sat to feast. He was honored with designated portions of the viscera of sacrificial animals during the installation of the NIN.DINGIR,¹ the *kissu* rituals,² and the *henpa* of oxen.³ He consecrated ritual offerings during the *kissu* ritual for Ea⁴ and the *henpa* of oxen.⁵ And certain ritual actions were performed in his residence.⁶

¹ Emar 369:58.

² Emar 388:63.

³ Emar 394:42.

⁴ Cf. Emar 385:25-26.

⁵ Cf. Emar 394:41.

⁶ Cf. Emar 426:5.

Nothing akin to those actions can be observed in the *zuku* festival text, where the king is named only as financier. Such an inactive role, rather, corresponds to two other calendrical ritual texts, Emar 452 and 463, each of which record rites for a single month and each of which also involves the king only as a source of provisions. I have already noted that these texts evidence a funding scheme similar to that of the *zuku*, with the cooperation of several distinct suppliers. By way of acknowledging the different nature of the king's involvement in the rituals of these texts in contrast to that of his appearances elsewhere, another common feature among the calendrical texts comes to light. In them, the king is always called simply LUGAL, "the King." But in all other ritual texts where the king participates actively, his title is consistently LUGAL KUR, "King of the Land."⁷ Functionally, the variation in the king's title delineates his role in the ritual—as participant or as provider. The three Free Format calendrical texts—Emar 373+, 452, and 463—stand out as a unit of calendrical rituals which derive the greatest part of their funding from LUGAL, "the King."⁸

⁷ Three times the extended phrase "LUGAL KUR (ša) ^{uru}E-mar," "'King of the Land' of the city of Emar" is used. For this longer phrase, cf. Emar 369A:17, 55; 392:1. The extended phrase makes clear that 'King of the Land' is a title rather than a descriptive phrase, as "King of the Land of the City" is not a meaningful statement. In 369A, the addition of the elements "^{uru}E-mar," which are not present in the other preserved copies, serve to specify Emar's king in light of the addition of another royal participant, the king of Šatappu. Cohen has mistakenly averred that no king of Šatappu ever existed, preferring to see the title "king of Šatappu" as an additional title for Emar's king ["The Administration of Cult in Hittite Emar," *AoF* 38 (2011): 151 n.37]. The copies of Emar 369 belie this notion. In line 14f., the C and E copies prescribe the setting of four banquet tables and correspondingly there are four participants named: the previous NIN.DINGIR, the NIN.DINGIR of Šumi, the *maš'artu*, and the King of the Land. But the A text increases the number of tables to five, and correspondingly adds to the list of participants the king of Šatappu. The extra table is for the extra guest: the separate figure of the king of Šatappu.

⁸ The commonalities among these three texts, to my mind, suggest that they belong together in something like a series of calendrical rites. Such a series would be a Free Format analogue to what already exists in the Conventional Format on a single tablet: Emar 446, the tablet of rites for six months. That ritual calendar names months I-VI in sequence and specifies ritual practices to be observed in each month, with at least half the tablet being occupied with rites for month I, which seems to contain rituals that became associated with *zuku* practice. Correspondingly, Emar 373+, 452, and 463 represent calendrical descriptions of rites for the months they contain, only on separate tablets rather than combined into one. And, like month I of Emar 446, month I in this Free Format series—if that is what it is—is far more extensive than the others and, notably, not performed annually.

The magnitude of the king's financial investment in the *zukru* festival is breathtaking, especially in light of the comparatively miniscule expense of the rest of Emarite ritual events.⁹ Did the local monarchy, which, for much of its existence can be described as a modest institution, truly shoulder the burden of such a staggering expenditure alone? Such a proposition seems unlikely, at best. Rather, in light the 13th century interventions of Karkamiš in Emar and the probable motives I have outlined in the last chapter, a more reasonable inference about the nature of *zukru* festival funding is that, ultimately, it derives from Karkamiš. This might be true in one of two ways, or a combination of both.

In the first place, as discussed in the previous chapter, all indications point towards an evolution of the Emarite monarchy towards greater wealth and power during the period of Karkamiš intervention and, undoubtedly, with Karkamiš support. It was during this period, beginning with Pilsu-Dagan, that Emar's king began to contract many sales of property alone, without the collaboration of the city, which can only have resulted in fuller coffers for the palace. Correspondingly, claim penalties began to be directed to the palace, further contributing to the king's wealth, insofar as claims were actually raised successfully to prompt the payment of the exorbitant fees. So, based on what we know about the evolution of the monarchy and the traditionally limited role of the king in Emar, it is unlikely that a local king could have afforded the extravagant *zukru* festival prior to the developments in monarchical power associated with Pilsu-Dagan's reign, thanks to the apparent support of Karkamiš.

⁹ In animal provisions alone, Emar 373+, by its own accounting, calls for seven hundred sheep and fifty oxen. Cf. Emar 373+:206. The installation of the NIN.DINGIR (Emar 369), by comparison needs only around thirty sheep and four oxen. The *maš'artu* installation (Emar 370) requires just upward of ten ovines and perhaps seven oxen.

But, even as the provisions for the *zuku* festival are sourced from the local king, it is not at all unlikely that they ultimately derive from Karkamiš, itself, perhaps only routed through the local palace. Such a scenario would be consistent with the picture of Karkamiš support for Emar's kings and finds precedent elsewhere in the Hittite empire. In fact, the sum total of *zuku* festival provisions matches almost exactly the annual budget of ritual donations provided by the Great King of Hatti to the city of Tarhuntašša for the maintenance of its cult and likewise for the festival of the storm god in the Anatolian cities of Kašša and Ḫanḫana—none of which was attached to any direct involvement on the part of the financier.¹⁰ Since the Hittite central authority is known to have supplied funds for ritual use in its periphery, it is possible—even likely—that Karkamiš, as the viceroy and representative of the empire to Syria, played the same role, endowing just such imperial grants to Emar.

So following the money of the *zuku* festival leads to the interests of not one but two parties. In the first place, the (local) king is the recorded source of provisions and the enormity of his donation would have been a show of prestige for him in the city. But, one way or another, it is clear that the local king owes that great investment to the benefaction of Karkamiš, which ruled on behalf of the empire.¹¹ Hence, the political significance of the festival's performance must be evaluated with the understanding that it was effectively offered by the Hittite authority.

¹⁰ Cf. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 677. Volkert Haas and Liane Jakob-Rost, "Das Festritual des Gottes Telipinu in Ḫanḫana und in Kašša. Ein Beitrag zum hethitischen Festkalender," *AoF* 11 (1984), 16-17.

¹¹ Knowing that the ultimate source of the finances was Karkamiš rather than the local king, the scribe of the Free Format calendrical rituals might have utilized the variant designation for the king—as LUGAL rather than LUGAL KUR—intentionally, though there is no reason to doubt that, locally, the offerings were attributed to Emar's king. The occasional interchange between designating the source as "king" and "palace," combined with the references to what are clearly local deities associated with "the palace" suggests that the offerings come most immediately from the hand of Emar's king.

zukru Practice under Hittite Aegis

Because Karkamiš and, by extension, the Hittite authority can be identified as the ultimate financial supporters of the *zukru* festival, we must reexamine the ritual described in Emar 373+ as an event occurring under Hittite aegis. This perspective, in turn, invites us to appreciate the Hittite influences on the festival, which otherwise may not be obvious. It is precisely the Hittite/Karkamiš sponsorship of the festival that accounts for the dramatic changes in *zukru* practice that are attested between the shorter *zukru* texts, Emar 375+A-D, and the longer *zukru* of Emar 373+. That is to say, not only did the Hittite authority provide Emar with the supplies needed to observe its *zukru* ritual, it also took an active interest in the practice and introduced a number of amendments to its manner of execution.

Already in the course of analyzing the festival text (see chapter 2), it was shown that some details, such as particular types of ritual offering vessels, maintain a stronger affinity with a Hittite style of worship than a local, Emarite custom. Such details, though minor, are emblematic of the Hittite element in the administration of the festival. Something like the presence of a *huppar*-vessel is easily identifiable as Hittite and serves as a signpost indicating that other, less observable changes in the administration of the ritual are surely imbedded in the text, as well. But the Hittite influence on the ritual can also be appreciated on the very broadest levels of the festival's design, especially when seen in dialogue with Emar 375+, a strictly local, pre-Hittite influence form of the *zukru*.

In Emar 373+ the term “*zukru*” is consistently introduced with the determinative EZEN, “festival.” The very designation of the *zukru* ritual as a festival in Emar 373+ is an innovation in *zukru* tradition. The ritual is never described as such in the shorter text

of Emar 375+,¹² nor is the EZEN determinative used in the letter discovered at Mari that discusses the *zukrum* ritual in that city.¹³ In the multi-month ritual calendar Emar 446—undoubtedly the oldest ritual text from Emar—the determinative EZEN is never used to characterize any of the various rituals enumerated in that document. Neither is EZEN used in any of the few ritual texts discovered at Mari.¹⁴ It therefore appears that “festival” was not a native mode of understanding the public rituals in the Middle Euphrates region.

On the other hand, “festival” (EZEN) and “ritual” (SISKUR) were productive designations in Hittite ritual literature that served to typologize forms of ritual practice. Festivals tended to be larger-scale ritual events with ties to the calendar.¹⁵ They are connected with the official state cult and dominated by sacrificial activity.¹⁶ Such a description certainly obtains for the *zukru*, so it is natural that, under Hittite influence, the practice was reconceived as a festival. This category was also extended to three other Emarite rituals: the installation of the NIN.DINGIR of the storm god (Emar 369), the installation of the *maš’artu* of Aštartu of Battle (Emar 370), and the *kissu* rituals dedicated to various gods in the town of Šatappu (Emar 385-388).¹⁷ Although not tied to a recurrent, yearly calendar, these three rituals all involve large-scale, multi-day events, the action of which is organized by temporal measures. In contrast, other rites, such as the

¹² In the fragments of text that remain among the copies of Emar 375+, two preserved writings of the word “*zukru*” exist to show that the EZEN determinative was not employed: text A, line 17 (in the title *rēš zukri*), and text B, line 1. In its reading of Emar 375, MEDA obscures this important point by reconstructing the EZEN determinative for the word *zukru* in lines 1 and 2; [cited 2 July 2015]. Online: <http://virgo.unive.it/emaronline/cgi-bin/tavoletta.cgi?id=378>.

¹³ A.1121+A.2731: 3, 6, 8, 10.

¹⁴ Cf. Durand and Guichard, “Les rituels de Mari,” 19-78.

¹⁵ René Lebrun, *Samuha: foyer religieux de l’empire hittite* (PIOL 11; Louvain-la-Neuve, 1976), 44-48.

¹⁶ Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 692.

¹⁷ One small text fragment, Emar 496, refers to another festival, called the “Festival of Combat” (^{EZEN} *ta-ha-[zi]*; line 2). Rutz has suggested that this fragment belongs with Emar 370 and gives a name to the installation ceremony for the *maš’artu* of Aštartu of Combat (*Bodies of Knowledge*, 146-47).

imištu of the King (Emar 392), a smaller and shorter ritual, which may not have involved the element of public participation, received no special designation. While these other Emarite festivals have no forerunners showing their older, non-festival format, the analogy of the *zukru* ritual, which was clearly adapted from an older form into a “proper” festival mold, suggests that the others underwent such a process, as well.¹⁸ Fleming has suggested that this ritual typology was “inspired by”¹⁹ or “approximat[ing]”²⁰ of Hittite ritual classifications. But that view is based on the idea that the Emar rituals are purely and independently local phenomena, so they could only imitate Hittite forms. Based on the evidence I am presenting here, I suggest that they are better understood not as imitations of Hittite ritual types but rather adaptations into Hittite ritual typologies with the collaboration of the Hittites, themselves.

Another of the most prominent changes from the shorter to the longer *zukru* is the expansion of the interval to a seven-year cycle. The shorter *zukru* makes no mention of interval. But its calendrical nature—prescribing rites associated with an individually named month—most easily fits into a program of annual observance. That supposition is supported by the *zukru*’s relationship to the rites for the 15th of Zarātu recounted in the ritual calendar, Emar 446 (discussed above), which must be a catalog of annual events. With no evidence to the contrary, the best explanation is that when the (shorter) *zukru*

¹⁸ The “process” is that of textualization of the ritual in a mode compatible with Hittite ritual sensibilities. That other Emarite rituals became (re)conceived into the category of “festival” under the influence of Hittite involvement in Emarite cult need not necessarily suggest that those rituals also were subject to revision in performance or offered with Hittite sponsorship, as was the *zukru* festival.

¹⁹ Daniel Fleming, “The Rituals from Emar: Evolution of an Indigenous Tradition in Second-Millennium Syria,” in *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria* (ed. Mark Chavalas and John Hayes; BM 25; Malibu: Undena, 1992), 55.

²⁰ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 113.

ritual was attracted to the rites for the 15th of Zarātu attested in Emar 446, it preserved the annual interval of those rites.

In light of the annual nature of the local *zukru*, the seven-year cycle of the longer text is striking. It, too, is a likely Hittite intervention. Hittite festivals were differentiated into monthly, annual, and multiannual cycles, in which the timing, itself, was a crucial element.²¹ As for the multiannual cycles, AM 138 attests to the “festivals of the sixth year”—that is, rituals occurring on a sexennial cycle.²² Similarly, the *purulli*-New Year Festival for Telepinu in Kašša and Ḫanḫana seems to have taken place on a nine-year rotation.²³ Such calendrically-based, multiannual ritual cycles are not attested in the contemporary ritual texts from Ugarit, nor, to my knowledge, in any central Mesopotamian records.²⁴ While an absence of evidence cannot confirm that multiannual cycles were not native to Near Eastern ritual, the presently available evidence for this type of cycle suggests that it was a distinctly Hittite phenomenon imparted to Emar.

In the case of the *zukru*, we can observe that the originally annual cycle of the ritual was expanded on the Hittite model to a septennial interval—with the cycle of seven years perhaps a local adaptation of the multiannual format based on Semitic preference for temporal units of seven. There are no indications that the two forms of the *zukru* were ever practiced concurrently—that the shorter annual shorter *zukru* would have been

²¹ Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 691-95.

²² Cf. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 695. See also Giuseppe Furlani “Fest bei den Hettitern,” *RLA* 3, 44.

²³ There is some uncertainty about the cycle of this festival. The mention of a “*purulliya* festival of the seventh year” in an oracle text could suggest also that a seven-year cycle was also known in Hittite ritual timing, such as is attested in Emar’s *zukru* festival (cf. IBoT 2.129 Vs. 3-4). For a consideration of the timing for this ritual, see Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 698-99.

²⁴ Something similar might exist in the ancient Israelite cycle of sabbatical years, along with the Jubilee years accompanying every seven cycles. The practice of observing such multiannual cycles (or at least prescribing such observance) may be described as ritualistic, but the action itself is no ritual, nor is it accompanied by any prescribed ritual activity.

performed in years between the longer septennial *zukru* engagements.²⁵ Rather, the septennial *zukru* developed out of and replaced the annual *zukru* under Hittite influence.

The distinctive funding scheme of the *zukru* festival, which seems primarily to have derived its sacrificial donations from the Hittite authority in Karkamiš, has parallels in Hittite practices of ritual provisioning in the broader empire. The central authority is known to have supported religious festivals in outlying regions, especially in areas of special importance. In the famous bronze tablet treaty between Tudhaliya IV and his cousin Kurunta, Tudhaliya committed to furnishing the important state of Tarhuntašša with an annual supply of two hundred oxen and a thousand sheep to support its local ritual activity.²⁶ In this case, the provision appears to be donated as an endowment to be managed and apportioned by the local authorities. But donations for specific festivals are also known to have occurred. For example, a herd of fifty oxen and a thousand sheep were delivered from the central authority in Ankuwa for the festival of Telipinu in Kašša and Hanhana, occurring every nine years.²⁷ And the sacred city of Nerik is known to have received a thousand sheep for the observance of its *purulli*- festival.²⁸ These data are significant for Emar's *zukru* festival not only as they attest to the Hittite authority's donation of ritual (animal) supply for provincial festivals, but also in the particular numbers that they give, which correspond quite closely with the *zukru* festival's inventory of fifty oxen and seven hundred sheep.²⁹ Notable also is the fact that the

²⁵ Such is the interpretation of Fleming in *Time at Emar*, 105-109; Masamichi Yamada, "The *zukru* Festival and Its Preparatory Rituals in Emar VI 373: Their Schedule, Procedure and Gods," *Orient* 46 (2011): 141-160.

²⁶ Bo 86/299 ii 21-30. See Heinrich Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV. StBoT 1* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988).

²⁷ KUB 51.1++ i 1; KUB 53.14 iv 35'. See Haas and Jakob-Rost, "Das Festritual des Gottes Telipinu in Hanhana und in Kašša," 10-91.

²⁸ KUB 48.119 vs.? 9'-11'. See Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 696.

²⁹ Emar 373+:206.

provisions need not come directly from Hattuša, itself, but might derive from a secondary capital, such as Ankuwa. Karkamiš—the seat of Hittite government in Syria—would have played this role for Emar.

But it should not escape notice that Emar 373+ and the other Emar rituals that display an analogous funding scheme (Emar 452, 463) are unique in specifying additional, local sources for offerings. The text strives to make clear that the locality is not simply dependent upon the royal authority for its provisioning, but rather works in collaboration with the authority to provide for the local gods. A partnership is portrayed in the text, even though the final accounting reveals that ultimate sponsorship rests with the foreign authority.³⁰

Other reflexes of a Hittitizing principle in the expansive revision of the *zukru* ritual can be summarized more succinctly. Rising out of an earlier *zukru* form focused only on Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA, who remain the centers of attention of the longer *zukru*, the extension of cultic offerings in the longer version seemingly to every deity of every cultic installation within Emar’s reach, hierarchically arranged, favors Hittite sensibilities.³¹ The Hittites famously boasted of their “thousand gods,” which seems little to have been exaggerated due to their resistance to syncretization.³² A tendency towards systematically and exhaustively treating the gods is most clearly observed in the treaty

³⁰ See Table 14, page 224.

³¹ Emar 375+ does not treat “all the gods” together as a category for its sacrificial offerings. Neither is such a thing known from the comparable ritual archives at LBA Ugarit. The early text Emar 446:85 specifies a “return” (*tūrtu*) for the god Illila and “all the gods” (DINGIR^{mes} *gabbūma*), but this laconic reference leaves open the question of what gods are intended and, at any rate, indicates something quite distinct from providing cult offerings to literally every god in the region. It is, in particular, the fastidious listing and ranking of the deities in the ritual text itself that calls to mind Hittite theological concepts.

³² Gary Beckman, “The Religion of the Hittites,” *BA* 52 (1989): 99.

tradition, where the “thousand gods” appear in force in fixed, hierarchical ranks.³³ But also in festival practice, there are notable tendencies towards inclusiveness. Such is the case for the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival, in which the king and queen spend perhaps twenty successive days visiting and sacrificing in the temples of various gods.³⁴ The AN.TAḪ.ŠUM, with its exhaustive treatment of the gods, is the result of cult centralization in Hattuša.³⁵ Accompanying the concentration of the gods in the city was a responsibility to develop systems to ensure their efficient care. In addition to influencing the form of the *zukru* by imitation, this cultic sensibility may have served a similarly practical goal in Emar. The Hittite financiers, who have proven themselves to be deeply concerned for proper care of the gods, even those of foreign lands, might have sought to ensure that its funds were applied to the benefit of the entire divine population, lest they be responsible for a slight to any of the gods.

As I have previously noted, some ideological turns in the festival best reflect the relationship of center/province in the empire. Chief among these is the rite of unification between Dagan and ^dNIN.URTA—a development of the expanded *zukru*. The symbolism of the rite is rich: Emar’s city god, ^dNIN.URTA, is accepted by Dagan, the universal chief god, brought to ride with him in his divine vehicle, and escorted alongside him out of the primitive state of nature (the extramural shrine) and into the engineered

³³ Cf. Piotr Taracha, *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia* (DBH 27; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), 86.

³⁴ For the overview tablet of the festival, each day of which is further detailed in separate tablets, cf. CTH 604. Hans Güterbock, “An Outline of the Hittite AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival,” *JNES* 19 (1960): 80-89; and, more recently, Philo Houwink ten Cate, “A New Look at the Outline Tablets of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival: The Text-Copy VS NF 12.1,” in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. Gary Beckman, Richard Beal, and Gregory McMahon; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 205-219.

³⁵ Taracha, *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia*, 139. Manfred Hutter, “Religion in Hittite Anatolia: Some Comments on ‘Volkert Haas *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*,’” *Numen* 44 (1997): 79-80.

environment of the city in a great entrance parade. As a political symbol, the unification of ^dNIN.URTA (i.e. Emar) with Dagan (i.e. the ultimate political authority) expresses a transcendence of nationalism in recognition of the city's existence in the broader realm of empire. Dagan's acceptance of ^dNIN.URTA in his own vehicle in front of all the other gods who are assembled reveals also a sentiment of favoritism. The counterpoint of ^dNIN.URTA's (= Emar's) subordination to Dagan (= here, the Hittite regime) is the place of honor which ^dNIN.URTA is given in the cosmos (= empire). It is only by grace of this superior authority that ^dNIN.URTA is allowed to perform the ritual entrance into the city—a symbol of domination of the place—reminding him that his right to rule is dependent upon the goodwill of the authority. All of this, importantly, is expressed in terms of local theology. The subtlety of the symbolism is such that the Emarite pantheon need not be subordinated to any foreign religious ideas. This is no domination of religion; it is an ideological utilization of purely local religious thought.

It is tempting to place features such as the procession to an extramural setting for the festival's main events and the evident significance of the *sikkānu*-stones in dialogue with the Hittite festivals centered around veneration of the outdoor *huwaši*-stones. Major events such as the KI.LAM and AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festivals feature just such events and the famed “rock sanctuary,” Yazılıkaya, built by Tudhaliya IV, could be a titillating counterpart to Emar's *sikkānu* shrine. The same is true for the anointing of the stones with blood and oil, the best parallels for which are also Hittite. But, while the earlier *zukru* version of Emar 375+ is much more reticent with the details of its execution, it does seem that all these elements were primary to the local version of *zukru*. That is not to say that they could not be foreign influences from earlier cultural exchange with

Anatolia or, at least in the case of the blood rite, shared influence from Hurrian ritual ideas—if they are not simply evidence of a more ancient north-south cultural continuum. But they are not part of the revision and expansion of the ritual that is evident in the transition from Emar 375+ to 373+. That these fundamental elements of the *zukru* already resonate with established Hittite festival practice facilitates an easy and obvious transition of the ritual into the Hittite festival typology.

Finally, we must recall the mundane, yet perhaps even more compelling details of Emar 373+ that have already been identified in the textual analysis as betraying a marked Hittite influence. These include the use of the Hittite *huppar* vessel for ritual offerings, the use of “thick loaves” (^{ninda}KUR₄.RA), the most common prepared cereal offering in Hittite ritual, and the transportation of the divine image in the cart (^{gis}MAR.GÍD.DA), probably an adaptation of the prestige of wheeled transport in Hittite practice.³⁶ The thrust of these observations is that along with the Hittite sponsorship of Emar’s *zukru* ritual through Karkamiš came a systematic revision of the format and execution of the event that remade many of its elements in a Hittite image.

Hittite Involvement in Emar’s Cults

The alteration of the *zukru* ritual under Hittite influence was not an isolated phenomenon. This observation is reinforced by the numerous additional ways in which the foreign regime involved itself in Emarite religious affairs. Therefore, before discussing the reasons for a deliberate revision of the local ritual under Hittite guidance,

³⁶ On an orthographic level, it is also interesting to note that the designation of the *kurkurru*-vessel is KUR₄.KUR₄ in typical Hittite style rather than the Mesopotamian NÍG.TA.KUR₄.

it is necessary to complete the picture by describing the evidence of Hittite participation, primarily through Karkamiš, in Emarite cultic activity.

The very office known as “Diviner (of the Gods of Emar),” occupied by Zū-Ba‘la and his progeny, is itself a powerful representation of Hittite involvement in Emarite cult. The range of responsibilities of the Diviners and the evidence for their daily affairs have been described in detail by several commentators, so there is no need to duplicate their efforts.³⁷ I only wish to emphasize here that the office the Zū-Ba‘la family occupied was so deeply beholden to Hittite interests that it can be considered a Hittite office, although the ethnicity of its occupants was not Hittite. Fleming recognizes this dimension when he notes that “this position depended on imperial approval.”³⁸ So too Cohen, when he characterizes the Zū-Ba‘la family as “loyal collaborators.”³⁹ But previous descriptions may not have gone far enough in depicting the relationship of this office to the foreign authority.⁴⁰ There was a prominent individual in Emar called “diviner” prior to the Hittite interference, who occupied a place of prestige in the ritual practices of the city and so seems to have worked in service to the town.⁴¹ But nothing like the concentration of city-

³⁷ For a detailed discussion of the evidence for each Diviner and his activities, see Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 147-183. Cf. also Masamichi Yamada, “The Family of Zū-Ba‘la the Diviner and the Hittites” in *Past Links: Studies in the Languages and Cultures of the Ancient Near East Dedicated to Professor Anson F. Rainey* (ed. Shlomo Izre’el, Itamar Singer, and Ran Zadok; IOS 18; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1998). Démare-Lafont, “The King and the Diviner at Emar,” 207-217.

³⁸ Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 44.

³⁹ Cohen, “The Administration of Cult in Hittite Emar,” 154.

⁴⁰ Yamada has more fully recognized the place of at least one Diviner, Zū-Ba‘la, as “local staff” of the Hittites, though he seems not to recognize that the role of Diviner, itself, is the mechanism of official authority rather than the individual. Cf. Masamichi Yamada, “The Hittite Administration in Emar: The Aspect of Direct Control,” *ZA* 96 (2006): 222-234. At any rate, I would avoid his description of those local individuals in Hittite employ as “Emaro-Hittite” since it admixes the ideas of citizenship and even ethnicity into what should be a more clearly administrative issue. In the case of the Diviners, I would describe the office simply as a Hittite one, which is not to say it was occupied by an ethnic Hittite but rather that it derived its power from the ranks of the Hittite authority.

⁴¹ The evidence for such a role derives from the six-month ritual calendar, Emar 446, which must be a very ancient text. To be sure, other diviners appear in Emar texts—some of the early period of the First Royal House—but none of those indicate a special role that would suggest the designated individual was anything other than a practitioner of the divinatory sciences.

wide cultic authority into the hands of a single functionary is glimpsed prior to the work of Zū-Ba‘la, who appears in the documentation precisely at the same time that the surge of Hittite involvement in Emar becomes evident—that is, the onset of Free Format documentation.⁴² The correlation points to the likelihood that the office of Diviner of the Gods of Emar, as a managerial post, was a Hittite innovation that built upon the role of the pre-existing city office of “diviner.” Zū-Ba‘la certainly stood within that city tradition, but the responsibilities undertaken by him and his successors under this title were new and in direct service to the Hittite authority.⁴³

That the Zū-Ba‘la Diviners worked for the Hittites and not any local administration can be seen in the special privileges sometimes afforded them and in the official network in which they conducted their affairs. This story begins already with the patriarch, Zū-Ba‘la, whose access on at least one occasion reaches all the way to the Hittite Great King. In a now well-known episode related in some of the earliest Free Format documents from Emar, a man named Alziyamuwa—clearly a Hittite official—confiscated land belonging to Zū-Ba‘la and imposed service obligations upon him to which he was never previously subjected. Zū-Ba‘la was privileged to hold audience with the Great King to plead his case. All these events are reported in a rare Hittite-language letter authored by the Great King, himself, which demands that Alziyamuwa cease and

⁴² Diviners certainly played an important role in the city cults prior to Hittite involvement. A diviner (^{lu}MÁŠ.ŠU.GÍD.GÍD) has a role to play already in the very ancient ritual calendar, Emar 446. But this does not suggest that such an individual played the city-wide administrative role of the later ^{lu}HAL ša DINGIR^{meš} ^{uru}Emar.

⁴³ Of course, the nature of his post meant that the Diviner of the Gods of Emar was something of a civil servant and so his work was within the realm of local concerns. But there is no evidence to indicate a collaborative relationship with the local king or town government. The Diviners are only seen operating within the Hittite sphere of influence in the Emar documents and the very fact that they conducted their business in the Free Format rather than in the Conventional Format system for townsmen shows that they were treated as outsiders.

desist.⁴⁴ This document is followed up with a similar letter to Alziyamuwa—this one written by an unnamed king of Karkamiš, echoing all of the same commands already expressed by the Great King.⁴⁵ The same property may be referenced in a document of disinheritance of three of Zū-Ba‘la’s sons, when the patriarch accuses their mother of confiscating a tablet evidently related to the deed of the land, demonstrating that the matter did actually conclude in Zū-Ba‘la’s favor.⁴⁶ The testament of Zū-Ba‘la also reiterates the bequest of his landed property to his chosen sons and the disinheritance of the others.⁴⁷ Both of these legal actions were concluded in front of the king of Karkamiš, Ini-Teššub, and the tablets bear his royal seal. So, while there is no evidence that Zū-Ba‘la’s access to the Great King of Hatti was more than a one-time privilege, it is clear that his affairs remained permanently within the jurisdiction of the Karkamiš court, whose king personally oversaw his legal proceedings.

The same pattern continues for Zū-Ba‘la’s successors in the office of Diviner. Two otherwise unexceptional real estate purchase records belonging to Ba‘lu-qarrād bear the seal of Ini-Teššub—a level of authority that obviated the need for any additional listing of witnesses for these transactions.⁴⁸ Similarly, a slave purchase of Ba‘lu-qarrād was documented in the presence of Zulanna, a DUMU.LUGAL,⁴⁹ and sealed by the Overseer of the Land, Mutri-Teššub.⁵⁰ When Ba‘lu-malik had to enter arbitration to defend the legality of this very slave purchase on his father’s behalf, the process was undertaken “before the king”—certainly the king of Karkamiš in this case since the tablet

⁴⁴ SMEA 45 1.

⁴⁵ CM 13 32.

⁴⁶ Emar 202:13-14.

⁴⁷ Emar 201.

⁴⁸ Emar 206, 207. Beyer, *Emar IV*, 48-49 (A2).

⁴⁹ Emar 211:1.

⁵⁰ Emar 211:19. Cf. Beyer, *Emar IV*, 273 (I2).

is sealed by some nine individuals, all of whom appear to be Hittite, or at least non-Emarite persons.⁵¹ They include Mutri-Teššub, the Overseer, and Zulanna, who is called “chief of the scribes,” but who is likely the DUMU.LUGAL of the same name attested elsewhere.⁵² Finally, a document recording Ba‘lu-malik’s purchase of four children as slaves bears the seal of the Overseer of the Land, Laḥeya, as do the three accompanying clay impressions of the children’s feet that Ba‘lu-malik retained.⁵³

These data show more than the simple fact that the Diviners enjoyed the attention of high officials in the Hittite ranks. They demonstrate that when the Diviners conducted business, they did so within the jurisdiction of the Karkamiš court and its envoys. This observation is particularly significant in light of the fact that the Karkamiš court was not the only juridical option available in Emar at the time. The office that the Diviners occupied was contemporary with the existence of the local monarchy and the collective town government. Fleming and Démare-Lafont, recognizing that all of the Diviners’ business is related on Free Format, infer that the Diviners, in fact, may not have been native citizens of Emar since townsmen conducted their business in the juridical system linked with Conventional documentation.⁵⁴ The fact that the Diviners, themselves, were likely imported into Emar highlights the foreignness of the role they played there. The additional observation that the Diviners’ affairs commanded the attention of the highest

⁵¹ Emar 212. Emar 211 is undoubtedly the original bill of sale that Ba‘lu-malik would have used in court to prove the legitimacy of the purchase.

⁵² Emar 212:26. Cf. Emar 211:1. For the identification of these as the same individual, see Durand, review of *Recherches au Pays d’Aštata*. *Emar VI*, 73; Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 111.

⁵³ Emar 217, 218, 219, 220. Cf. Beyer, *Emar IV*, 58 (A17).

⁵⁴ Démare-Lafont and Fleming, “Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams,” 65. Démare-Lafont and Fleming suggest the town of Šumi as a possible hometown for the Zū-Ba‘la clan. If Cohen’s contention that Aštata and Emar are not actually the same locations, as has long been supposed, is correct, it would underscore Démare-Lafont and Fleming’s argument, though suggest a different hometown, since Zū-Ba‘la is referred to as the “man of Aštata” (LÚ^{uru}aš-ta-ta) in the Hittite letter, *SMEA* 45 1 (Cohen, personal communication).

officials in the non-native juridical system associated with the Free Format documentation shows that the Diviners were in no ordinary class of non-citizen residents but occupied a place within the foreign administration, itself.

The Hittite authorities were deeply interested and actively involved in supporting and managing the Emarite cult, at least since the time of the diviner Ba‘lu-qarrād. While this Hittite element is not directly evident in the ritual texts, themselves, it becomes increasingly clear if we consider the small cache of administrative documents discovered at Emar in both the M1 archive and in the temple of Ba‘lu, which—thanks especially to the sealings applied to some of the tablets—demonstrate that Emar’s cult operated to some degree under the imperial umbrella.

Emar 275 is one of the earliest documents that allows this official oversight to shine through—and it does so in two ways. The text provides a record of cultic personnel, organized into seven divisions corresponding to different cultic institutions, perhaps for the purpose of recording disbursements of rations. Each individual is identified by name, patronym, and, in some cases, a cultic title such as *zābiḫu ša DN* (“sacrificial priest of DN”) or *wābil ilāni* [“bearer of the (images of the) gods”]. One group of four individuals is designated as the staff of the NIN.DINGIR of Ba‘lu.⁵⁵ Included in this registry of cult employees is “Ba‘lu-qarrād son of Zū-Ba‘la, the diviner” (line 11), even as the conclusion of the text summarizes all of the preceding units as “seven houses (subordinate to) the supervisor, Ba‘lu-qarrād” (line 13).⁵⁶ Thus, the cultic institutions of

⁵⁵ Emar 275:6. For the best understanding of this line, see Fleming, *Installation*, 86.

⁵⁶ Arnaud read line 13 “7 é.meš *pa-<an>* ^dIškur-ur.sag,” emending the text to have these houses existing “before” Ba‘lu-qarrād. However, considering the content of the text, which clearly indicates that the aforementioned houses are subordinate to Ba‘lu-qarrād, the PA-sign is better read UGULA “supervisor.” Arnaud, himself, noted this possibility and MEDA reads as such in its text [cited 23 June 2016]. Online: <http://virgo.unive.it/emaronline/cgi-bin/tavoletta.cgi?id=278>. This is the only time in the Emar texts that the

the city were organized already at this time under the official supervision of the Diviner, who, in turn, was supported by Hittite power, effectively placing the local cults under Hittite supervision.

But the Hittite administrative involvement is further evidenced by the sealing on the text—a circular stamp seal inscribed with the Anatolian hieroglyphic designation, SCRIBE—and a name that is read by Beyer as Kutumilia.⁵⁷ Neither the sealing nor the name inscribed on it is attested elsewhere in the Emar documents, so it is impossible to uncover any details about this figure, who, on the one hand, may have sealed the tablet in official approval, or on the other hand, may simply have been the scribe who produced the tablet.⁵⁸ In either case, it is the fact that the individual seems not to be an Emarite that is relevant. He bears a non-Semitic personal name and carries a stamp seal, the likes of which are relatively rare at Emar and are known to have a long tradition of use in Anatolia.⁵⁹ From Emar documents, this type of seal is attested for some of the highest known Hittite officials, such as Ini-Teššub and Kuzi-Teššub, kings of Karkamiš, and Mutri-Teššub, the Overseer of the Land. So, whatever the role of Kutumilia in the drafting or confirmation of this important document, it is notable that a non-local officer of some type was involved in the creation of a cultic document that affirms the power structure of Emar's local cults.

Indeed, the supervisory power assigned to Ba'lu-qarrād in Emar 275 can be glimpsed in other administrative texts that deal with mundane affairs of the cult. Emar

Diviner is referred to as a “supervisor” of other religious orders, though that function is otherwise clear from his recorded activities.

⁵⁷ Beyer, *Emar IV*, 153-154 (C3).

⁵⁸ See Beyer, *Emar IV*, 444.

⁵⁹ Cf. Beyer, *Emar IV*, 146. Only twenty-four seals of this type are known from excavated Emar documents: Beyer's group C.

363, a notice of delivery for cultic wines, is sealed by Ba‘lu-qarrād,⁶⁰ as is Emar 366, a note of distributions of bronze to LÚ^{meš} *ku-ba-di*, probably metallurgists, likely for the manufacture of cultic objects and vessels.⁶¹

Emar 364 is another bill of cultic goods written in the same paradigm as Emar 363. It relates quantities of wine (KAŠ.GEŠTIN) that have been provided “for the gods” and bears the seal of Ba‘lu-qarrād. But this text is of special interest as it also specifies certain time designations for which the wine is intended: “4 *hubu* 3 *hizzibu* of wine for the month of SAG.MU; 8 *hizzibu* of wine for the month of Niqalu” (lines 1-2).⁶² It is tempting to view the specific grouping of this two-month supply of cultic wines in context of the sixth year offerings of the *zukru* festival, which also span the months of SAG.MU and Niqalu. There are too little data available for Emar cult administrative practices to confirm this suspicion; it is possible that delivery of provisions regularly occurred in such two-month intervals. But were it the case that this text should relate to wines that were destined for *zukru* libation vessels, we would see in it a pipeline for sourcing *zukru* offerings from the Hittite authorities, since the text crossed the palms of Ba‘lu-qarrād, an official in Hittite employ. Such a view of the text would have resounding implications for understanding *zukru* patronage, which I have already argued

⁶⁰ For the seal utilized by Ba‘lu-qarrād, see Beyer, *Emar IV*, 84 (A62). The seal is actually inscribed with the name Dagan-ahu—a personal name not attested in the Emar textual onomasticon. That this seal was used by Ba‘lu-qarrād is established by its impression along with a cuneiform legend identifying its owner in *SMEA* 30 7.

⁶¹ Arnaud and Pentiuc interpret the designation LÚ^{meš} *ku-ba-di* with reference to the well-attested *kubbadu* ritual, making them “men of the honoring-ceremony.” In this context, however, I am inclined to agree with Jean-Marie Durand and Francis Joannes that *kubadu* refers to a “heavy thing,” perhaps an “ingot,” making these men manufacturers of metal goods (“*kubbuddâ’u* à Mari et à Emâr,” *NABU* 1990/2 no.70). For an example of the profusion of bronze goods in an Emarite temple, cf. CM 13 28.

⁶² We should recall that all quantities of wine offerings in the *zukru* festival are specified in terms of the *kurkurru*-vessel, whose relationship to the *hubu* and *hizzibu*-vessels in terms of volume is unknown. Therefore, it is not possible to determine whether comparable amounts of wine are specified in Emar 364 and 373+.

traces back to the Karkamiš viceroy, since all the *zukru* wine offerings are specified as coming from “the king.” If the wines in Emar 364 were those very wines “from the king,” then the fact that they come through the Hittite official pipeline would necessitate that “the king” in the *zukru* refers to the Hittite viceroy.

The administrative oversight of Emar’s cult by the diviners proceeded as long as that office existed in the city and it continued to occur in conjunction with other officials in the Hittite matrix of power. Of the scant evidence for the tenure of Šaggar-abu, Ba‘lu-qarrād’s eldest son and immediate successor, the letter Emar 261, written together with Šaggar-abu’s uncle, Kapī-Dagan, who seems to have assisted Šaggar-abu and perhaps effectively co-occupied the post of Diviner, provides some evidence for management of cultic affairs. The letter appeals for assistance from a superior in retrieving sacrificial “oils of the gods” that have been taken to the village of Šatappu. As can be noted in many of the ritual texts, Šatappu existed within the religious sphere of Emar and certainly would have fallen under the purview of Emar’s Diviners. For the Diviner to seek outside help in the cultic jurisdiction of Šatappu suggests that the appeal is directed to an individual of a higher standing, presumably a Hittite officer. This consideration favors Cohen’s suggestion that the addressee of the letter, called only “Adda,” is not a personal name but rather an appellative of respect, “father,” for a high Hittite official.⁶³

As a temporary party to the office of diviner after the death of Ba‘lu-qarrād, Kapī-Dagan is known to have played a similar administrative role in the cult. His seal, alongside the seal of Ba‘lu-malik, Kapī-Dagan’s nephew who would soon assume the office of diviner, appears on Emar 43, an inventory of the temple of Aštartu that was

⁶³ Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 162. Cf. Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge*, 288, 295 and Durand, review of *Recherches au Pays d’Aštata. Emar VI*, 76-77 who suggest Adda is really Ba‘lu-qarrād.

excavated from the adjacent temple of Ba‘lu. This document is sealed by two additional parties about whom much less is known: Abunnu and Ari-Šarruma. The sealing of neither man is attested again in the Emar tablets. The latter individual bears a Hurrian name, which suggests but does not confirm that he is a non-Emarite who probably plays some administrative role. Reinforcing the impression that Ari-Šarruma is no local citizen with a foreign name is the fact that he is owner of a “Syro-Hittite” type ring seal—a group which is dominated at Emar by individuals bearing foreign names. Beyer was confident enough about this identification to write that Ari-Šarruma was “sans doute partie de ces fonctionnaires hittites, subordonnés aux «fils du roi» ou «chef du pays».”⁶⁴ If so, then also during the time of Kapī-Dagan (presumably still corresponding with that of Šaggar-abu), the Diviners shared responsibility for cultic matters with non-local Hittite officials.

Emar 285, another cultic inventory, must also derive from this period of “co-regency” between Kapī-Dagan and Šaggar-abu, with Ba‘lu-malik also playing an administrative role. Although Šaggar-abu is not named at all in the text, Kapī-Dagan is mentioned with the title ^{lu}HAL, “Diviner” and Ba‘lu-malik with the designation DUMU HAL “Diviner’s son,” clearly indicating that the text was written prior to Ba‘lu-malik’s ascendancy. Like the last inventory, this tablet is also sealed by Ba‘lu-malik and an individual who is identified as Punu on his seal—a “Syro-Hittite” ring seal type—making it likely that he was a Hittite officer playing a similar role to that of Ari-Šarruma in Emar 43.

The situation continues much the same in the latest periods of the Diviner’s archive, after the death of Šaggar-abu, when Ba‘lu-malik assumed the office in earnest. In

⁶⁴ Beyer, *Emar IV*, 444.

fact, in terms of administrative overlap between Emar's Diviner and Hittite officials, the evidence of this Diviner is the most abundant, probably for the simple reason that the documents of the period are the most proximal to the end of the archive. Ba'lu-malik can be found independently supervising cultic interests,⁶⁵ but he appears to have worked especially closely with one Hittite official, Kili-Šarruma, whose biography is slightly better known to us. In the cuneiform legend for his seal in one living testament, Kili-Šarruma is identified as the son of Mutri-Teššub, the most thoroughly documented Hittite Overseer of the Land in the Emar texts.⁶⁶ The office of Overseer of the Land probably never passed to Kili-Šarruma; another individual named Laheya, who is also identified as a son of Mutri-Teššub, took up that mantle.⁶⁷ But, judging from his involvement in administrative affairs, Kili-Šarruma must still have held an influential position, perhaps propelled by the high rank of his father and, subsequently, his brother.⁶⁸

Kili-Šarruma impressed his seal alongside that of Ba'lu-malik on Emar 61, a docket for a container of (precious) stones excavated from the temple of Ba'lu. In the Diviner's archive, Emar 287, a cultic inventory for NIN.KUR of the village of Uru and Halma, is likewise sealed by both men. Additionally, the illicitly excavated texts CM 13 28 and 29, both also cultic inventories, bear the same two seals.⁶⁹ The evidence of these

⁶⁵ Ba'lu-malik's seal can be found on Emar 56, a record of silver delivered to a craftsman, apparently for fabrication of cultic goods. That the document pertains to the cult is revealed by its findspot in the temple of Ba'lu and by comparison to Emar 57, a nearly identical document that appends the notation NÍG ^dU, "property of Ba'lu." This latter tablet was sealed by Ba'lu-qarrād son of Kapī-Dagan, Ba'lu-malik's first cousin.

⁶⁶ *SMEA* 8 30:36.

⁶⁷ Cf. AuOrS1 72, where he is identified as the son of Mutri-Teššub, and Emar 90, where he is given the title of Overseer of the Land.

⁶⁸ Cf. Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 114. Like other important or wealthy individuals, Kili-Šarruma was in possession of multiple seals, all "Syro-Hittite" ring seals (Beyer, *Emar IV*, B33, B63, B64).

⁶⁹ CM 13 28 inventories goods belonging to Erra of Ešši and Adamaterra, and also contains a note concerning Šaggar-tali, the former temple administrator. CM 13 29 inventories items of Rašap, Lord of Šagma.

texts suggests that Kili-Šarruma and Ba‘lu-malik, one Hittite and one Syrian officer in Hittite employ, collaborated in a two-step verification process of inventory control for cultic institutions within the Emarite sphere of influence. In at least one case, Kili-Šarruma supervised a cultic delivery without the participation of a Diviner—an even more stark insertion of foreign official presence in the local cult.⁷⁰

The foregoing administrative documents demonstrate administrative collaboration between Emar’s Diviners and foreign Hittite officials, but there are also glimpses of a more unilateral management of Emarite cult by the Hittite officers. The strongest evidence to this effect is found in Emar 268, a letter by a Hurrian-named individual, Akal-Šimege,⁷¹ to Zū-Ba‘la—either the patriarch of the Zū-Ba‘la family of Diviners or perhaps the son of Ba‘lu-malik more commonly known by the hypocoristic, Zuzu, though it is unknown whether that son ever occupied the post of Diviner.⁷² Akal-Šimege is identified with the title ^{lú}x[(x)], where x might be read UGULA, perhaps making him an otherwise unattested Overseer of the Land. In any case, the format and content of the letter make clear that Akal-Šimege is Zū-Ba‘la’s superior.⁷³

As the contents of this missive are eye-opening for the role of Hittites in cult management, it is beneficial to reproduce the text here.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <i>um-ma</i> ^m <i>A-kal-</i> ^{dr} UTU ^{lú} UGULA [?] ¹ | Thus says Akal-Šimege, the Overseer. [?] |
| [(x)] | |
| 2. <i>a-na</i> ^m <i>Zu-Ba-la</i> | Say |
| 3. <i>qí-bi-ma</i> | to Zū-Ba‘la: |

⁷⁰ AuOrS1 97. Emar 271 may also reflect a cultic inventory overseen only by a Hittite official. That text is yet another cultic inventory sealed (only) by a “Syro-Hittite” ring seal (Beyer, *Emar IV*, B49). The seal is inscribed in hieroglyphs the divine name Teššub, which could be an invocation of the god or form part of the seal owner’s personal name.

⁷¹ Cf. Pruzsinszky, *Personennamen*, 115.

⁷² See Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 178-180.

⁷³ Durand claims that Agal-Šimege was “une très haute autorité religieuse de Carkémish,” which stands to reason, given the content of the letter, though this cannot be established in any independent way (review of *Recherches au Pays d’Aštata. Emar VI*, 79).

4. DINGIR ^{meš} <i>a-na šul-ma-ni PAP-ur</i>	May the gods protect your well-being!
5. <i>ú-ul aq-ba-ak-ku</i>	Did I not tell you,
6. <i>um-ma-a L[Ú] šu-ú</i>	“This man has been named to the temple
7. <i>a-na^{lu} SANGA-ut-ti ša^d NIN.KUR</i>	administration of NIN.KUR”?
8. <i>iq-q[a-b]i-mi a-na^{lu} SANGA-[ut-ti]</i>	Appoint him to the temple administration
9. <i>ša^d NIN.KUR šu-ku-u[n-š]u</i>	of NIN.KUR! Why have you not
10. <i>am-mi-ni la-a ta-aš-ku-[u]n-^rš^u</i>	appointed him?
11. <i>ù at-ta ta-aq-ba-^ra¹</i>	But you said,
12. <i>um-ma-a ki-[i] at-ta</i>	“When you
13. <i>ta-la-ka</i>	come
14. <i>a-na^{lu} SANGA</i>	I will appoint him
15. <i>a-šak-kán-šu-mi</i>	as temple administrator.”
16. <i>i-na-an-na^ra¹-[n]a-ku</i>	Now, I have
17. <i>la-a al-^rli-ka¹</i>	not come
18. <i>ù at-ta la-a ta-aš-[ku-un-š]u</i>	so you have not appointed him.
19. <i>i-na-an-na ki-i-me-e</i>	Now,
20. <i>^{lu.meš} SANGA ú-na-ka-ru</i>	appoint Adda son of Išbi-Dagan
21. <i>^mAd-da DUMU Iš-bi-^dKUR</i>	to the temple administration
22. <i>^ra¹-na^{lu} SANGA-ut-ti</i>	of NIN.KUR so that he will effect the
23. <i>ša^d NIN.KUR</i>	transfer of the
24. <i>šu-ku-un-šu</i>	temple administration!

Here we see a foreign member of the Hittite power structure issuing explicit orders to a member of the Diviner’s family—the highest local administrative authority for the cult—concerning the management of cultic personnel in Emar. This reveals not only that the authority of Emar’s Diviner extended to the appointment of cultic officials, but also that the Diviner himself was answerable in matters religious to the authority, which could and did exert control over cultic affairs.⁷⁴

The same type of Hittite control over Emarite cult administration can be found in another letter, Emar 264, written by Ba‘lu-malik to a Hittite superior named Pirati.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ This one-sided record cannot tell us whether the appointment of Adda ever actually came to pass, though we might note that CM 13 17, a list of payments to cultic personnel, contains a certain Adda among its ranks. The patronym in that case is broken, making it impossible to confirm that the same Adda is intended.

⁷⁵ The interpretation of this letter is considered in detail by Yoram Cohen in “A Family Plot: The Zu-Bala Family of Diviners and Hittite Administration in the Land of Aštata” in *Acts of the Vth International Congress of Hittitology: Çorum, September 02-08, 2002* (ed. Aygöl Süel; Ankara: Nokta Ofset, 2005) 213-224.

Ba‘lu-malik complains that his uncle, Kapī-Dagan, is interfering with proper cultic maintenance by withholding the gods’ allotments. Furthermore, Kapī-Dagan has threatened to go to the king—undoubtedly the king of Karkamiš—to obtain an official appointment to the office of Diviner. This episode must have occurred in the wake of Šaggar-abu’s death, when Ba‘lu-malik would have succeeded to the office of Diviner as per the stipulations of the will of their father, Ba‘lu-qarrād.⁷⁶ However, as we have seen, Kapī-Dagan was already performing some of the duties of the Diviner alongside Šaggar-abu. In this letter, it is clear that he sought full appointment to the office, attempting to supplant Ba‘lu-malik’s claim. Ba‘lu-malik beseeches his superior, “May my lord stand firm in not allowing him to do it!”⁷⁷

Thanks to this letter, it is clear that the very succession of the office of Diviner, the highest cultic position in the city (in addition to whatever other functions the office held), despite being passed on hereditarily, was subject to the approval of the Hittite authority and, ultimately, the king of Karkamiš. This comes as no surprise when it is understood that the position of “Diviner of the Gods of Emar” was an official appointment in the Hittite ranks, set apart from the traditional role of the town diviner from which the office evolved. But the ongoing interest on the part of the Hittite authorities in the operations of Emar’s cultic administration, such that officials would bother themselves with its workings, betrays a deep involvement in the religious life of the city.

⁷⁶ Cf. *SMEA* 30 7.

⁷⁷ Emar 264:28-30. For a detailed review of this text, see Yoram Cohen, “A Family Plot,” 213-24.

Cults of Anatolian Deities at Emar

In addition to the evident managerial role of members of the Hittite ranks in the cults of Emarite gods, the abiding presence of the Hittites in the realm of Emarite religious practice is given clear expression through the group of texts labeled by Arnaud as “les rituels anatoliens.”⁷⁸ These texts evidence a ritual and theological tradition clearly distinct from that reflected in the local ritual literature. Important differences appear in the types of offerings that are donated to the gods, the vessels that are used for presentation, and, to an extent, the verbiage used to describe ritual action. But, above all, the difference lies in the pantheon. Invoked in these texts are many divinities who are never attested elsewhere in the Emar documents, but who can be linked to deities known from Hittite or Hurrian texts from the archives of Hattuša. Indeed, one of the texts identifies itself with such a telling description: “Tablet of rites for the gods of Hatti.”⁷⁹ Whether describing the contents of these texts as “rituals” is technically correct is a matter for debate—Doris Prechel has pointed out that, rather than preserving instructions for ritual performances, these tablets may just as well contain cultic inventories based on Hittite models.⁸⁰ But in any case, the implication of the text group is the same: there existed in Emar actively attended cults for deities whose origins and seats of worship lie in Asia Minor.⁸¹

⁷⁸ This category is primarily composed of Emar 471-490 and at least some of the fragments numbered Emar 491-535. Discussion of this subset of the ritual texts is based primarily on the three most complete tablets, Emar 471, 472, and 473, to which many of the remaining fragments surely belong.

⁷⁹ Emar 471: 1.

⁸⁰ Doris Prechel, “Hethitische Rituale in Emar?” in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference* (ed. Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo d’Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen; AOAT 349; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 243-252.

⁸¹ Concern for the expedient and ongoing care of the Anatolian deities is evidenced by the broken letter Emar 271, which expresses the sender’s exhortation for the “gods of Hatti” to be fed.

What are we to make of this evidence, which shows that Emar cared for an entire divine population that was apparently kept distinct by virtue of its foreignness? Arnaud characterized this as “l’impérialisme religieux,” though he left open the question of how the phenomenon came to pass and why it is not attested elsewhere.⁸² I see no reason to assume that the mere existence of cults of Anatolian gods indicates that they were forcibly imposed at Emar. Nor do I believe that the characterization of the cults as imperial imposition, which might indirectly imply a lack of embrace by the subjugated population, is justifiable.

It is also possible that these cults were established and kept segregated at Emar to enable Hittite officials stationed in Emar to worship their own gods.⁸³ In this scenario, the foreign gods would not have been so much a burden on the Emarite citizens but existed only for the convenience of outsiders. But supposing such a strict separation between the cults is wantonly divisive. Need we suppose that the citizens of Emar were so religiously exclusive that they would fail to embrace the highly regarded deities of other regions?

The larger problem with positing a foreigners’ cult at Emar is historical. Firstly, it presupposes a kind of permanent Hittite occupation of Emar, for which evidence is simply non-existent. Texts and sealings attest to the presence of many Hittite individuals imbued with official power at Emar, but neither the permanence of their residence there nor the depth of their numbers at any given time is ever revealed. The evidence we have attests to Hittite presence primarily through supervisory officials; any type of permanent

⁸² Daniel Arnaud, “Les Hittites sur le moyen-Euphrate: Protecteurs et Indigènes,” *Hethitica VIII* (1987), 18-19.

⁸³ So Daniel Fleming, “Emar: On the Road from Harran to Hebron” in *Mesopotamia and the Bible: Comparative Explorations* (ed. Mark Chavalas and Lawson Younger; JSOTSup 341; London: Sheffield, 2002), 232.

garrison based in the city is purely imagined. But whatever the size of the Hittite cadre deployed in Emar—if such a thing really existed—supposing that a separate cult existed for its benefit must assume that its members were sufficiently able to provide for the needs of its gods in care, feeding, and ritual obligations. These officials would have to have performed the roles of cultic personnel in addition to their administrative responsibilities. Or were permanent foreign priests, about whom we know nothing, also deployed to fulfill these obligations? In either scenario, why are the tablets pertaining to these cults found together with those of the local cult, if they were kept so distinct?

At any rate, there is no simple way to view the host of deities related in the “Anatolian rituals” as a Hittite cult for Hittite individuals. The divine population of the texts does not reflect any discrete or coherent unit of national gods. Quite the contrary, it creates a unique *mélange* of gods drawn from across the regions of imperial presence. For it to serve outsiders at Emar, it would have to serve outsiders from far and wide, lumped together into a single, artificial cultic unit. More likely, the international character of the pantheon reflects the Hittite political theology during the imperial period that projects territoriality through a connection of the pantheon with the geography of the empire.⁸⁴

While it is important not to underestimate Emar’s capacity for religious inclusivity, we must not be too eager to envision some excitable polytheistic impulse for collection of new gods for the local cult.⁸⁵ After all, the documents themselves conceive of this pantheon as something separate: “the gods of Hatti.” Correspondingly, these

⁸⁴ Taracha, *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia*, 86-87.

⁸⁵ So, perhaps, Yoram Cohen, “Public Religious Sentiment and Personal Piety in the Ancient Near Eastern City of Emar during the Late Bronze Age,” *Religion Compass* 1/3 (2007), 333-34.

deities are not integrated in the ritual texts of local cultic practice.⁸⁶ So while it is not necessary that foreigners were the only ones worshipping these gods at Emar, it is true that they were not (yet?) fully woven into local theology.

What lies between imposition from above (i.e. imperialism) and voluntary adoption or imitation of high culture is an organically negotiated process of rapprochement among religious cultures, which is the best explanation for the presence of the “Anatolian cults” at Emar. In the first place, the bequest of care for gods associated with the ruling territories would have endowed a measure of responsibility to the province that could even be seen as empowering—after all, it requires great confidence to entrust the care of the gods to a population not otherwise beholden to those gods. Doing so also elevates the status of the city as a holy site for the gods and relinquishes manifestations of the beloved deities into the control of the local population, which would not have taken its responsibility lightly. Gods—even those of foreigners—must be properly appeased. But the phenomenon is bilateral. The importation of gods of imperial rulers provides an ever-present reminder of their hold on the province and the local presence of their gods imitates their watchful eye on the goings-on in the city. But in broader terms, the deliberate presence of a blended foreign cult demonstrates imperial support for Emar in assignment of the gravest of responsibilities—care of the gods—while also conspicuously reminding the city of its dependency.

Yet a subtler dimension of this delicately negotiated cultic importation is the way in which it facilitates Emar’s identification of belonging within the empire. Taking part in

⁸⁶ Rarely, a deity known from the “Anatolian Rituals” appears in a local ritual text, though there is no reason to think such inclusions derive directly from the “Anatolian cult” at Emar rather than from an organic process of the local cult’s incorporation of that particular god in that particular instance.

the religious practices of foreign parties carries the unavoidable consequence of increasing cultural understanding and “de-other-izing” the outsiders, engendering a certain sympathy and receptiveness that could translate into a reduction in indignation and perhaps even a heightened sense of loyalty. Moreover, recalling that the deities of the blended foreign cult are not exclusively Hittite but rather stem from all over the empire, participation in this cult promotes a cosmopolitan mindset that situates Emar as one among many parts of a whole. The appreciation of and responsibility for gods of diverse regions of the empire facilitates through religious ritual on the local level a shift of focus from narrow nationalism—to use the term loosely—towards a broader sense of multiculturalism under the umbrella of Hittite rule.

To be sure, there is a dimension of this importation of religious culture that represents imperial interference in provincial religion. But “religious imperialism” it is not. This delicate process is rather a two-sided, cooperative phenomenon that creates a web of support and responsibility on both sides. And because it is within the power of ritual to influence its participants’ view of the world (see below), the kinds of religious collaborations that took place between superior and subordinate must have had the effect of shaping the perceptions of each regarding the other.

The Hittite Interest in Emar’s Cults

The question of the reasons for such evidently deep involvement of the foreign rulers in Emar’s cultic and ritual affairs yet remains. Cohen ventures a solution by speculating that the Hittites involved themselves in religious institutions as a strategy for

the extraction of resources and funneling towards the imperial center.⁸⁷ After all, he notes, there is no evidence of a heavy-handed participation by the Hittites in the Emarite economy. What is the point of an empire if not profit? The windfall, in Cohen's view, would have come in the form of cultic offering materials and control over cultic resources, thus providing a financial gain for the imperial authority.

But there is no evidence that any cultic resources, such as those attested in the cultic inventories that are sealed by Hittite officials, ever left the city. The act of enrolling cultic valuables in registries unavoidably carries the downside of making the scope and location of centers of wealth apparent. But cultic inventories are, after all, not a unique genre that would suggest an interest in extracting the wealth they catalog.⁸⁸ Such documents are routinely created apparently for no other reason but the interest in accounting for and safekeeping cultic artifacts.⁸⁹ They need not imply intent to exploit the wealth they catalogue.

Moreover, quite to the contrary of exporting goods, various other cultic administration documents suggest *delivery* of goods, rather than export.⁹⁰ As for extraction through cultic offerings, it is in no way obvious that sacred materials intended for offering by sacrifice to local gods at local temples could somehow be funneled to the benefit of the core empire. As we have seen, some of these offerings were probably wholly burnt; others were consumed by local participants in rituals. If priests were

⁸⁷ Cohen, "The Administration of Cult in Hittite Emar," 154.

⁸⁸ On the contrary, it has been suggested that the purpose of Hittite cult inventories was to facilitate the intensification of cultic resources. Cf. Carl Georg von Brandenstein, *Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten* (MVAG 46/2; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1943), 1. Cf. Charles Carter, "Hittite Cult Inventories" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1962), 17-18 n.3.

⁸⁹ A famous example of such inventories from the regional neighborhood of Emar are the detailed cultic inventories from Qatna; see Jean Bottéro, "Les inventaires de Qatna," 1-40 and "Les inventaires de Qatna (Suite)," 137-215.

⁹⁰ These are the documents Arnaud labelled "Livraisons culturelles," Emar 363-368.

entitled to consume portions offered to the gods, since these occur in local temples, it stands to reason that even these consumers would be local persons.

But, above all, the thesis advanced here that the *zukru* festival is ultimately conducted with the financial support of Karkamiš inverts Cohen's argument, since, as primary financier of the festival, the outside authority can be seen as *investing* in the Emarite cult rather than exploiting it financially.

The path to understanding the Hittite investment in Emarite cult and, specifically, in the *zukru* festival is to view the injection of personnel and wealth in its broadest political context. As I emphasized in the previous chapter, perhaps the single greatest defining issue for Hittite policy in Emar in the second quarter of the 13th century was the rising threat of Assyrian aggression east of the Euphrates. I have suggested the possibility that the entire Hittite bureaucratic presence at Emar, as well as the Free Format system of textual documentation that accompanied it—beginning only shortly before 1270—was due to the Assyrian menace. It is precisely in this way that the Hittite involvement in ritual and cult must be understood. With the breakdown of the Hurrian rump state and particularly with its final fall to Assyria, Emar would become the frontier of the Hittite empire with Assyria whose expansive designs were clear. Recognizing the importance not only of maintaining a buffer between Assyria and the core of the empire, but also the prospect of losing power in Emar by virtue of its rising importance as a border state, the Hittites wisely adopted a policy of support for Emar and its native institutions.

The policy of supporting Emar's institutions is already observable at the most fundamental level of Emarite politics: the local kingship was allowed to coexist with the foreign rule of Karkamiš. But much more than granting the local monarch his right to

exist, the regime seems to have gone further and actually promoted the local kingship, helping to strengthen its role in local governance. This is evident in the rising power of the local king Pilsu-Dagan, who, not coincidentally, ruled alongside Šahurunuwa and Ini-Teššub of Karkamiš—those rulers who initiated the investment in Emar. Security and stability in Emar were the primary interests of the Hittite rulers and these interests, they must have perceived, were best served through strong and stable local governance as well as an appreciable, non-threatening diplomatic presence.

The kind of cultic responsibility that Hittite appointees assumed in Emar is not unlike that which was shouldered by officers elsewhere within Hittite control in earlier periods. The long set of instructions directed to commanders (*BEL MADGALTI*) of Hittite border regions contains many directives concerning the administration of religious life in such regions. Temples must be restored and priesthoods maintained to ensure proper reverence of the gods of the place.⁹¹ Moreover, many 13th century Hittite cult inventory texts stemming from various imperial regions attest to a growth in resources for local cults on the direction of the central regime.⁹²

The support for Emar's institutions is observable nowhere more drastically than in the changes in Emar's *zukru* ritual, which might even be considered a public centerpiece for display of the Hittites' benefaction for the important region of Emar. It is clear, for reasons already discussed, that the Hittites greatly expanded the pre-existing *zukru* ritual, endowing it with previously inconceivable levels of funding and reinterpreting some of its elements in line with Hittite practices. But the core of the ritual remained noticeably unchanged and, remarkably, the pantheon that was worshipped in the event retained its

⁹¹ CTH 261. Cf. Ada Taggar-Cohen, *Hittite Priesthood* (THeth. 26; Heidelberg: Winter, 2006), 11-15.

⁹² Cf. Carter, *Hittite Cult Inventories*, 17-21.

unmistakably Syrian character. The ideal behind the Hittite involvement was, thus, not one of control or conformance, but rather of support for local traditions.

In exchange for their patronage, the Hittite rulers would have engendered good will in the province through their magnanimity and shored up local support there. But naturally, in addition to making a show of generosity, there were ideological strings attached. On the one hand, as I have already explored in the analysis of the ritual actions, some of the changes in ritual practice may have favored an imperial ideology. Couching ideology in ritual practice would have a particularly powerful, yet especially subtle impact, since rituals help to shape its participants' perceptions of the world on a subconscious level (see below). Moreover, as with any act of patronage, generosity is only one side of the issue—the other is the implicit debt incurred by the patronized party.

Better still, if we endeavor to rise above the dichotomous approach of cost-benefit assessment, we might see Hittite support of the *zukru* and all of Emar's religious institutions as an act of carving out a place of belonging and identification within the Hittite empire and especially within its own religious ideology. In light of the recognition of Emar's importance vis-à-vis Assyria, the Hittite rulers bolstered their commitment to the local government of Emar and reinforced the town's local identity, while also encouraging a certain cosmopolitanism that results from recognizing one's place in the larger realm.

Historical Context and the Dating of the zukru Texts

Although the *zukru* ritual texts do contain some roughly dateable elements, their chronology can be only minimally understood without enlisting external assistance. The

relative dating of the *zukru* texts based on historical considerations associated with scribalism has already been examined, with the results indicating that Emar 375+A must precede the installation of the Zū-Ba‘la family (early 13th century or before), and the Free Format manuscripts of Emar 375+, along with Emar 373+, cannot be earlier than *c.* 1275.

But Emar 375+A demonstrates something more significant, still. While its existence in the Conventional Format shows that, at the time of its composition, the *zukru* ritual it contained was under the purview of the local city government—the only set of institutions to utilize this format and employ the scribes who wrote it. So, the crossover of scribal systems that Emar 375+A to Emar 375 B-D reflects is not about updating scribal procedures, since, in fact, the Conventional Format persisted, but rather represents the transfer of responsibility for the *zukru* ritual away from the local collective institutions. The transfer would have happened at the same time that Emar’s cultic system, as a whole, fell under the umbrella of the non-local authority: presumably as early as the Diviner Zū-Ba‘la but certainly established by the time his son, Ba‘lu-qarrād occupied the office. So the importance of the scribal format of Emar 375+A for the relative chronology of the *zukru* texts is that it reflects a period of Emar ritual and cultic management free of the foreign involvement represented by the Diviners and their Hittite official collaborators. It can only be seen as preceding the *zukru* texts written in the scribal system that developed alongside the work of those non-local persons.⁹³

It should by now be clear that the longer *zukru* version of Emar 373+ is an expansion of the 375+ ritual under the Hittite aegis of Karkamiš. After the expansion and

⁹³ Even though Emar likely rid itself of Hittite hegemony prior to the end of the city, it is not feasible to consider Emar 375+A a product of the post-Hittite arrival period, since the authorship of Conventional Format documents had ceased prior to that development and did not resume.

extension of the interval of *zukru* performance to seven years, it is not necessary that any form of the Emar 375+ ritual went on being performed annually. The innovations of Emar 373+ appear to represent changes in *zukru* practice rather than additions to it, bringing an end to the observation of the Emar 375+ ritual and making 373+ the latest known version of a *zukru* text. If that assessment is correct, then our relative chronology of the exemplars can be proposed thusly: Emar 375+A (earliest phase) > Emar 375+B-D (medial phase) > Emar 373+ (latest phase).

Although the above chronology best suits what I understand to be the development of the ritual, there is no evidence to prohibit the contrary notion that these two different rituals could have been performed in tandem—that is, with Emar 375+ being practiced in the years between observances of Emar 373+. This would open the relative dates significantly, allowing us only to assert that Emar 375+A is the earliest text, with all the rest coming sometime after. Here I would note that this understanding requires that two different ritual complexes bearing the same name were performed concurrently. And the ritual recorded in Emar 375+ would actually be the rites mentioned in Emar 373+ as occurring in the preparatory sixth year on the 15th of SAG.MU.⁹⁴ I find it curious that these rites are detailed in Emar 373+ as sixth-year preparations if they were routinely performed every year, anyway. What might bring curiosity to unlikelihood is that these rites appear to have been funded by the king and the Temple of the Gods, like other days of the *zukru* festival.⁹⁵ Yet such a funding scheme is nowhere evident in the

⁹⁴ The alternative would be that two sets of nearly identical rites (procession of Dagan to the *sikkānu-stones*, feasting, veiling, return to the city) would be performed individually (in tandem?) on the same day. Yet nothing in the festival text contextualizes its sixth-year performances amid ongoing celebration of a putatively concurrent annual *zukru* ritual.

⁹⁵ The accounting for 15th of SAG.MU rites is only observable in the extremely broken beginning of the tablet, Emar 373+:1-4. The date is not preserved, but there can be no doubt that it was the 15th of SAG.MU since (1) the following date is the 25th of SAG.MU, which means the date must be prior and (2) Part II of

shorter *zukru* ritual, where those institutions—most notably and perhaps importantly, the king—are absent. Why should the festival’s ideological funding scheme be imposed upon a contemporaneous, annual *zukru* ritual in the sixth year, when no hint of that scheme or its ideology is otherwise present in the text of the annual *zukru*? These tensions are relieved by recognizing the probability that the septennial *zukru* supplanted its annual counterpart.⁹⁶

In order to suggest a greater chronological precision, the emerging political context that has been the focus of our discussion must be brought to bear—and therein lies a caveat. Lacking empirically dateable elements in the texts themselves, the analysis of their probable chronology can offer only likelihoods, not certainties. My intention is to elucidate the rituals by heightening awareness of the political context of 13th century Emar, when they would have occurred. As such, certain political axes of the century emerge as natural catalysts of change for the *zukru* ritual tradition, which offer compelling, if only potential, junctures on the *zukru* timeline.

There is an important chronological anchor for the involvement of the Hittites in Emarite ritual that is suggestive for the expansion of the *zukru*. One sacrificial list witnesses the inclusion of the “Baliḫ-gods of the vine(yard) of Hešmi-Teššub.”⁹⁷ As we

the text also begins with the 15th of SAG.MU, which can only be paralleled here for its accounting. Although much of the text is restored rather than preserved, enough exists to identify the sources with certainty.

⁹⁶

⁹⁷ Emar 379:9-10. Cohen misunderstands Hešmi-Teššub’s appearance in the sacrificial list when he claims that Hešmi-Teššub was “the recipient or perhaps the sponsor of the sacrifice, representing the ‘king of the land’” (“The Administration of Cult in Hittite Emar,” 152; cf. *Scribes and Scholars*, 41). Cohen apparently overlooks the fact that Hešmi-Teššub, himself, is not an entry in the list but rather only a descriptive part of the two-line phrase “the Baliḫ-gods of the vine(yard) of Hešmi-Teššub.” It is the gods who reside on Hešmi-Teššub’s property, not Hešmi-Teššub, who receive offerings.

have seen, Hešmi-Teššub was a Hittite DUMU.LUGAL and the brother of Ini-Teššub, king of Karkamiš.

It is possible, in fact, that this sacrificial list is associated with an actual *zukru* practice, as Arnaud, himself, perceived.⁹⁸ At least one other list is clearly associated with a *zukru* event in its longer format,⁹⁹ and others have a divine population quite similar to that of the *zukru* festival, as well.¹⁰⁰ Emar 379 does have unique correspondences with the longer *zukru*'s hierarchical god list, though it lacks essential *zukru* players such as Dagan *bēl bukkari* and Šaššabêttu and is not nearly long enough to be a complete account. So rather than dating a particular performance of *zukru*, I understand the text as another contributor to dating the Hittites' involvement in Emar's sacrificial cult. This text establishes that major Hittite participation was underway during Hešmi-Teššub's career at Emar, which, in turn, suggests that the *zukru* expansion should have taken place in the same period.

Pursuant to the contextual factors I have been describing, the primary motivation for the increase in Hittite presence in Emar and concurrent involvement in ritual activity is the rising power of Assyria to the east. Hešmi-Teššub's participation confirms that the intrusion occurred earlier, rather than later, in the period of Hittite presence, which was already demonstrated through the collaboration of the Diviners with Hittite officials in documents pertaining to cultic management. How, then, can the final, expansive phase of the (Hittitized) *zukru* festival be dated in absolute terms? This question provides the occasion to consider the chronology of the Assyrian advance in Hanigalbat that was

⁹⁸ Arnaud, "Les hittites sur le moyen-Euphrate," 20.

⁹⁹ Emar 378.

¹⁰⁰ Emar 380-382.

discussed in the previous chapter. I have already suggested that the impetus for the increased attention to Emar by Karkamiš—the deployment of Karkamiš officials, election of the Diviner as a representative, and the accompanying Free Format scribalism that developed—was a consequence of the threat presented by the advance of Adad-nirari I towards the Euphrates. This occurred in the 1270s, around the time of the death of Adad-nirari. Considering that the Hittite-sponsored office of the Diviner, with its quintessentially religious nature (despite what other functions it entailed) was already active at this time, and especially if the cultic directive, Emar 268, was issued to the patriarch Zū-Ba‘la, himself, it is clear that the Hittite involvement in the local cult began immediately with the onset of Karkamiš interference in Emar. Those considerations suggest that the medial *zukru* phase, if I am correct to suspect that such a phase existed, began as early as *c.* 1275.

As we have seen, however, the approach of Adad-nirari I was really only the beginning of the Assyrian crisis for the Hittite empire on the Middle Euphrates. The threat may have abated for a time during the transition between Adad-nirari and his successor, Shalmaneser I. But by the time Shalmaneser completed his march through Hanigalbat, he had completely subjugated that territory up to the Middle Euphrates, facing both Karkamiš in the north of Hittite Syrian territory and Emar in the south and brought the final collapse of whatever rump state of Mittani had existed. These actions initiated competition between Hatti and Assyria, that culminated in the Battle of Nihriya, after which the Hittites accepted Assyrian sovereignty east of the Euphrates. For the Hittite viceregal kingdom at Karkamiš, these developments would have been the new and most pressing foreign policy issues and demanded a new kind of attention to the now

vulnerable frontier territory of Emar. A formidable, supportive presence of Karkamiš emissaries was already established in the region; now was the time for an investment of resources into an ideological program in Emar that aimed at shoring up its place within the Hittite sphere of influence. The centerpiece of this program was the massive and ostentatious *zukru* festival (Emar 373+), newly retooled to project Emarite religious practice in terms of a Hittite worldview.

A likely date for the intensification of the Hittite investment in Emar represented by the expansion of the *zukru* thus depends upon the dating of Shalmaneser's attainment of firm control throughout Hanigalbat and ensuing conflict between the Assyrians and Hittites. Thanks to recent work on the eponym years of Shalmaneser's reign, his military victory resulting in the final subjugation of Hanigalbat can be dated with confidence to his eighth year, 1263.¹⁰¹ This date represents the earliest possibility for the initiation of the *zukru* expansion and would result in an understanding of the *zukru* reforms as occurring under the ultimate purview of Hattušili III—no doubt acting through his viceroy, Ini-Teššub.

However, such a timeframe may not result in the most convincing picture of *zukru* development. On one hand, it allows only about twelve years for the medial *zukru* phase, for which three textual exemplars are attested. On the other hand, in the period following Shalmaneser I's conquest, the immediate Hittite reaction seems to have been a policy of (measured) aggression. It was not until the eruption of full-scale hostilities at Nihriya and

¹⁰¹ One of the several copies of his royal inscription, *RIMA* 1 A.0.77.1 is dated with the eponym Aššur-nādin-šumāti, making that year a *terminus ante quem* for the completion of the events described. For the relative placement of that year within the set of Shalmaneser's eponyms, see Yigal Bloch, "The Order of Eponyms in the Reign of Shalmaneser I," *UF* 40 (2008): 146, 153-54.

the Hittite defeat there that Hatti cut its Hurrian losses and shifted its foreign policy.¹⁰² Relations with Assyria became diplomatic in attempt to avoid further conflict and loss.¹⁰³ But with acceptance of the new political borders, establishing loyalty and security in the border regions would necessarily be priority. Since the expansion of the *zukru* is, in part, a political overture to Emar on behalf of the empire, the battle of Nihriya represents a compelling fulcrum for this development, with all its ideological implications. Although the Battle of Nihriya cannot be dated precisely, it must have occurred in the 1240s, during the short overlap of the reigns of Tudhaliya IV and Shalmaneser I.¹⁰⁴ If I am correct in viewing this watershed moment in Hittite-Assyrian political history as the best context for the *zukru* expansion, then the Hittite king at the time of the *zukru* reform was Tudhaliya IV, rather than his father Hattušili III, probably still through the agency of Ini-Teššub. The potential relative chronology of the *zukru* phases that I have proposed translates into absolute terms as follows: Emar 375+A, pre-c. 1275 > Emar 375+B-D, 1275-c. 1240 > Emar 373+, c. 1240 and beyond.

Despite the existence of only one copy of the *zukru* festival text, there is evidence to suggest the distinct occurrence of another *zukru* engagement related to Emar 373+, perhaps even a repeat performance, which has an impact on the chronology of the texts.

We have already seen how the sacrificial god-list, Emar 378, bears unique

¹⁰² Cf. KBo 4 14, probably composed under Tudhaliya IV, which acknowledges the Hittite defeat at Nihriya and permanent loss of the Hurrian lands.

¹⁰³ Cf. Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat*, 188ff. with textual citations.

¹⁰⁴ Nihriya, in fact, represents a problem for the chronology of these rulers and forms part of the foundation for some calls to revise the dates of the Hittite kings, which have always been less certain than those of their Assyrian counterparts, upwards. Cf. esp. Alexander Nemirovsky. "Synchronism of the Era of Hattusili III and the "Low" Chronology of the Late Bronze Age Century", *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii*, 2 (2003) 3-15. Bloch has suggested raising the accession of Tudhaliya IV possibly as early as 1249, which allows a greater correspondence between his reign and that of Shalmaneser I [Yigal Bloch, "Setting the Dates: Re-evaluation of the Chronology of Babylonia in the 14th-11th Centuries B.C.E. and Its Implications for the Reigns of Ramesses II and Hattušili III" *UF* 42 (2010): 73-84].

correspondences with the hierarchical god-list of Emar 373+. ¹⁰⁵ Emar 378 contains an orthographic oddity that suggests an authorial attribution: it spells the DN Šaššabêttu as ^dŠa-aš-ša-bit-ti. Such a spelling of the name only occurs in one other Emar text: CM 13 24:18 (^dŠa-aš-ša-bit-ti), a dedicatory inscription written by Ba‘lu-malik. ¹⁰⁶ The use of the É-sign for the syllabic value /bit/ seems to have been a quirk of the Diviner Ba‘lu-malik’s. ¹⁰⁷ The orthographic correspondence suggests it was he who wrote Emar 378, particularly since we expect that text to have been written by a Diviner, in any case. Because Emar 373+ uses a consistent and different orthography for the DN Šaššabêttu (^dŠa-aš-ša-be-ti), it seems to have been authored by a different individual. Ba‘lu-malik was the last Diviner of Emar to contribute a substantive body of textual documentation, so Emar 373+ must have been composed prior to his assumption of the office, likely during the highly productive tenure of his father, Ba‘lu-qarrād, who held the position, in rough estimation, between 1250 and 1220.

As it happens, this possible chronology of the *zukru*’s evolution offers an unmistakable correspondence with the broader picture of developments in the Hittite empire. Around the same time that the Hittite presence began to increase in Emar, correspondent with the end of Šahurunuwa’s reign in Karkamiš and the rise of his son, Ini-Teššub, the usurper king Hattušili III was coming to power in Hattuša. Hattušili III is

¹⁰⁵ Although Emar 378 makes no specific mention of *zukru*, the fact that it mentions, indeed begins with, Dagan *bēl bukkari*—a title exclusive to the *zukru* festival—strongly suggests that this list was intended to be used for a *zukru* performance (even if we are unable to confirm that it would have been precisely the same septennial format as Emar 373+).

¹⁰⁶ Although a title or patronym is not given in CM 13 24, the nature of the inscription makes it likely that its Ba‘lu-malik is individual of the same name who held the position of Diviner. So Daniel Fleming, review of Joan Westenholz, *Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem: The Emar Tablets, Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 45 (2002): 369; Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*, 178.

¹⁰⁷ His signed copy of ur₅-ra = *hubullu* glosses Sumerian apin-gu₄ with *e-pi-nu er-bet-ta* (Emar 545D:132). The other extant copy that preserves this line glosses *e-pi-nu 4-ta* (Emar 545E:132).

famous for his piety—he was a priest and particular devotee of Ištar of Samuha, as was his wife, Puduḫepa, who played an enormously influential role in the politics and religion of the empire. Puduḫepa was, herself, a former priestess, and, upon the accession of her husband, became a religious leader throughout the empire.¹⁰⁸ Especially for the case of the *zukru*, it is notable that Puduḫepa founded a program of reform and consolidation of state-sponsored cult throughout the empire.¹⁰⁹ “In her capacity as chief priestess,” in the summary characterization of Trevor Bryce, “Puduḫepa seems to have ordered a comprehensive collection and organization of religious texts, and to have made extensive revisions to religious ceremonies and rituals.”¹¹⁰ Such a sweeping program is a natural outgrowth of the Hittite attitude towards managing ritual activity in the imperial period when “Die in ihrer ursprünglicheren Form sicherlich noch einfachen und nur an wenige Regeln gebundenen Rituale wurden spätestens nach ihrer Übernahme durch den hethitischen Staat unter der Obhut der Priesterschaft gesammelt und nach einem einheitlichen Konzept gestaltet.”¹¹¹

In this context the extension of the core empire’s program of codification and revision of rituals, led by Puduḫepa, to Emar appears as a natural outgrowth of Hittite policy, even if it only affected Emar once the political motive of Assyrian threat

¹⁰⁸ The importance of Puduḫepa in the sphere of religion as well as politics is explored by Heinrich Otten, *Puduḫepa: Eine hethitische Königin in ihren Textzeugnissen* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur: Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, vol. 1975/1; Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1975). Puduḫepa is mentioned in a number of dream-omen texts, e.g. KUB 31 77—relating a dream of her own—which additionally records her participation in ritual operations outside of the imperial seat of Hattuša. She is also the author of some lengthy prayers, including CTH 384 (KUB 51 26 + KUB 21 27), in which she pleads with the sun goddess of Arinna for the health of her husband, the king, and CTH 383 (KUB 21 19+), which she composed together with the king.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Otten, *Puduḫepa: Eine hethitische Königin in ihren Textzeugnissen*; M. Darga, “Puduḫepa: An Anatolian Queen of the Thirteenth Century B.C.” in *Mélanges Mansel (Festschrift Arif Müfid Mansel) II* (ed. E. Akurgal and U.B. Alkim; Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1974), 939-61; and the summary comments of Itamar Singer, *Hittite Prayers* (WAW 11; Atlanta: SBL, 2002), 101.

¹¹⁰ Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, 287.

¹¹¹ Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 676.

prompted the increase of Hittite presence (via Karkamiš) there. Recognizing Emar's place in the Hittite cultic reforms provides a backdrop for the recopying of the traditional *zukru* into the updated scribal format and especially for the later expansion of the ritual into the Hittite mode of festival practice, when it became politically expedient to do so with the final acceptance of Assyrian sovereignty in Hanigalbat. To be sure, the extension of the Hittite program of ritual codification likely accounts for much of Emar's ritual archive, which was developed in the Free Format primarily during Ba'lu-qarrād's tenure as Diviner. But the *zukru* festival represents something more: a reimagining of the existing ritual in a Hittite mold that far outstrips the magnitude of the other festivals and rituals and sets itself in sharp distinction to them in content and execution.

Even the *zukru* festival's mode of textualization, with its tripartite structure, favors a Hittite model of festival documentation. Itamar Singer has described the essential components of Hittite festival literature as being (1) description of all rites and ceremonies in the order they occur, (2) script of liturgical speech, and (3) detailed inventory of provisions, including the naming of sources and recipients.¹¹² The two textual parts of Emar 373+ that remain legible embody precisely the essential elements of ritual description and inventory.¹¹³ Hence, there is cause to suspect that the adoption of such a multi-part textual structure, which is not attested in the other Emarite rituals, was programmatic.

The close relationship of Emar 452 and 463 to 373+—all Free Format calendrical rituals with a common funding scheme, expressed in matching terminology—suggests that those texts were developed on the same horizon as the expanded *zukru* festival,

¹¹² Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival: Part One*, 52.

¹¹³ For the potential contents of Part III of the text, see page 161.

perhaps as a type of textual series of calendar rites. Moreover, since those three texts together relate the ritual activities for four months of the year, they are reminiscent of the Conventional Format six-month ritual calendar, Emar 446, which relates rituals for the first half of the year on a single tablet. In this light, Emar 373+, 452, and 463—presumably along with two other single-month tablets that have not been discovered—may represent an intentional revision of the older calendrical ritual system into textual forms that favor Hittite ritual sensibilities.

That such ritual developments occurred after the turning point of Nihriya during the reign of Tudhaliya IV would not be at all surprising in terms of what we know of that ruler. After the death of Hattušili III, Puduḥepa continued to exercise her power during the reign of Tudhaliya IV, her son, resulting in the much-discussed and far-reaching cultic reforms associated with that ruler.¹¹⁴ To say that the influences and involvement of the Hittite rulers in Emarite ritual are an extension of those reforms would be partly true: no doubt the involvement of Hittites in Emar's cult continued during this time and perhaps increased. In fact, it is likely that the cults for Anatolian deities were established in Emar under Tudhaliya IV.¹¹⁵ But it is clear that the Hittite interest in Emar reaches back much further, proceeding ultimately from political considerations in the Middle Euphrates region as early as the reign of Muṣṣili II, who summoned ritual experts from Aštata to Hattuša to ensure that a rite for Išhara of Aštata was being performed

¹¹⁴ The cultic reforms of Tudhaliya IV have received attention especially through the work of Carter, *Hittite Cult Inventories*. For Emar, Michel has already noted the consistencies between Tudhaliya's reforms and certain features of Emarite religious practice (*Le culte des pierres*, 47-48, 257-59).

¹¹⁵ Cf. Prechel, "Hethitische Rituale in Emar?," 250.

correctly.¹¹⁶ Such early overtures already show the rising importance of Emar to the core empire, that would only continue to grow as the Assyrian threat worsened.

¹¹⁶ KUB 5 6 + 18 54 + KBo 53 103 I 6-48.

CONCLUSION
POWER, POLITICS, AND CHANGE IN THE *ZUKRU* RITUALS

More than just being a religious event with political implications, the *zukru* festival in mid-13th century Emar was, itself, politics. The pre-existing *zukru* ritual, which was native to the Middle Euphrates region, was co-opted by the imperial authorities, adapted into a mode consistent with their own notions of ritual performance, expanded drastically in interval, length, and scope, and endowed with an ostentatious fund of sacrificial donations. All this occurred in Emar just as Emar's importance as a newly established frontier of the Hittite empire with the aggressive Assyrians began to develop. But for all its modifications, in religious terms, the purpose of the ritual remained unchanged. It is not as though Karkamiš repurposed the ritual, from the emic perspective, for its own religious purposes. Rather, the *zukru* continued to be an event offered on behalf of the Emarite people to the benefit of the local gods. The Hittite injection into the festival was a grand show of generosity and support for Emar. But, as a political phenomenon, the ritual was couched with a reminder of where Emar's allegiances should lie and underlined by a show of the wealth and resources of the ruling party. Moreover still, the process would have encouraged a kind of mutual identification of the ruler and ruled as the empire carved out a place in their own ritual system for Emar's practices while Emar was invited to view itself in the mold of membership in a larger political entity.

What are we finally to make of the deliberate choice of the imperial power to exercise its influence specifically in the realm of ritual and cultic practice? We have already seen that there were political motivations to act and to engender goodwill in

Emar, which the support of local religious institutions would certainly have done. But what makes this type of interference a particularly effective mode of achieving the goal of imperial unity? Or, to ask the question in theoretical terms: what valences of ritual activity make it an attractive means of expression on the part of a ruling body?

A traditional view of public ritualization is one that interprets them as an expression of social solidarity in favor of the status quo. So when a society publicly worships its god, it is not truly the god who is worshipped, but rather the society, itself. By ritual behaviors “people project the secular socio-political order in which they live onto a cosmological plane.”¹ Accordingly, all public ritual favors and reinforces “the way things are,” and in so doing legitimates the extant balance of social power. This means, in effect, that ritual is a mechanism of social control, since it will always support regnant powers. Such is the view influentially expounded by Émile Durkheim.

Nearly a century of refinement of Durkheim’s model obviates a need for a critical discussion, though I raise this bastion of traditional interpretation to suggest that it and other models built on the foundations of ritual as control cannot adequately explain the development of the *zukru* festival, with its intentional, politically motivated amendments. *zukru* was a preexisting (pre-Hittite) ritual practiced in Emar, suspended in its own social nexus. Yet when the ritual is amended in a reflection of Hittite interests, it does not simply lose its previous symbolic associations and transfer its powers of legitimation to the empire. That would imply a full recontextualization of the ritual, when, in fact, its identity conditions remain the same.² To assume that the ritual simply reinforces the

¹ Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power*, 37.

² Carl Seaquist has proposed a methodology for evaluating changing ritual practices that seeks to identifying “when a ritual stops being the ritual that it is..,” centering on the conditions that characterize the

extant power structure ignores the ritual's own developmental history and associations with alternate socio-political forms.

The case of the *zukru* adds a layer of complexity to the picture of social ritual, since one society's ritual is offered under the aegis of another. If the ritual is a reflection of society, then certainly it is the local, dominated society whose image is seen. The *zukru* is a distinctively Syrian ritual and the cosmos is expressed through Syrian divinity. This reflection is incompatible with the political realities of Late Bronze Emar. All this to say, the public *zukru* ritual, even under the influence of the Hittites, cannot be seen as a measure of social control, nor should it be understood as an accurate reflection of the socio-political situation at Emar during the Late Bronze Age.

It is possible, quite the contrary, to perceive a certain incongruity between the underlying social picture illustrated by the ritual and contemporary *realpolitik*. The recognition of a disconnect between ideology and reality in the face of pressing political considerations could, itself, be identified as a mechanism for Hittite interference in the *zukru* ritual's plan. Such an incongruity, argues Jonathan Z. Smith, is fundamental to the development of ritual, which

*represents the creation of a controlled environment where the variables (i.e., the accidents) of ordinary life have been displaced precisely because they are felt to be so overwhelmingly present and powerful. Ritual is a means of performing the way things ought to be in conscious tension to the way things are in such a way that this ritualized perfection is recollected in the ordinary, uncontrolled, course of things.*³

The recognition of incongruity should serve as a signifier that, while the ritual itself is not an expression of control, it *is* an expression of an idealized (from the point of view of the

practice; see "Ritual Individuation and Ritual Change," *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 21 (2009): 340-360.

³ Jonathan Z. Smith, "The Bare Facts of Ritual," *History of Religions* 20 (1980): 124-25. Emphasis original.

ruling party) social relationship. As such, the ritual represents—better, *is*—a mode of negotiating social power, as its practitioners and sponsors steer the social narrative it imparts upon its participants. So, even as simple narratives of ritual-as-control should be eschewed, it remains true that, as a fertile field for the brokerage of social power, rituals are capable of concealing *attempts* to control through manipulation of symbols, ideology, and through competition for power.

Rituals are effective agents of power competition because of what Stephen Lukes calls the “third dimension of power.” The first dimension of power is the ability of one party to prevail over another in decision-making situations. The second dimension accounts for the ability of a party to constrain the field of possible decisions only to those which do not adversely affect the party. The third dimension is the ability of one party to shape and influence the perceptions of another in such a way that the influenced party neglects or misrecognizes its own interests altogether. Exertion of this kind of power

prevent[s] people, to whatever degree, from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they see it as natural and unchangeable, or because they value it as divinely ordained and beneficial.⁴

This observation means that particular acts of foreign intrusion not immediately recognizable as movements of political power, in fact, have the potential to be attempts at power exertion. Viewed from the third dimension, it appears that the Hittite regime relied less on measures of overt control—on the contrary, they strengthened *local* monarchical control—but pressed their agenda through measures aimed at shaping the perceptions of the subjugated population. How would they have enacted such a program? They would

⁴ Stephen Lukes, *Power: A Radical View* (2d ed.; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 28.

have done it by co-opting the local symbolic system, adjusting its significations to affirm a Hittite bias. They would have done it by commandeering the management of local cult to influence religious practice in such a way as to reinforce and propagate their own ideology. And, coming to the point, they would have done it by assuming some responsibility over the performance of ritual.

Ritual is a fundamental organ for the development of perceptions. It impresses upon its practitioners “sets of assumptions about the way things are and should be.”⁵ Ritual does not engage its participants in dialogue about beliefs; it need not reflect beliefs, at all. Rather, through repetition it normalizes certain behaviors and actions in which the ritual community participates, thereby imparting its priorities onto its participants. On the non-cognitive level, it is a matter of embodiment of the ritual’s norms. As Catherine Bell describes it, ritual produces ritualized bodies—those which, through praxis, are conditioned in accordance with the worldview of their society.⁶ As a mode of repetitious action—and especially as one that, in some cases, facilitates contact with the divine—ritual is a process that influences or even creates people’s view of reality.

Consequently, to commandeer ritual practice is tantamount to taking control of the world that the ritual’s practitioners inhabit. Likewise, changes in the form or content of the ritual have the potential to effect changes in the very perceptions the practitioners harbor concerning the order of their world. It is in this way that the Hittite interference in

⁵ So Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York; Oxford: University Press, 1992), 176, summarizing Clifford Geertz, *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali* (Princeton: University Press, 1980), 123-24. Cf. Also Clifford Geertz, “Ethos, World View, and the Analysis of Symbols,” *The Antioch Review* 17 (1957): 421-47; repr. in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 126-41.

⁶ Catherine Bell, “The Ritual Body and the Dynamics of Ritual Power,” *JRitSt* 4 (1990): 299-313.

the *zukru* festival amounts to an exercise of power in its third dimension: they have attempted to influence the worldview of their subjects in such a way that the subjects accept Hittite ideology as their own, perceiving themselves as part of a system that affirms the legitimacy of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled.

Neither is it necessary that the Hittite authorities, in interfering in Emarite religion, were conscious of the exertion of power their actions entailed. All evidence to the contrary: it seems that the religious management of Emar was some extension of core Hittite religious policy. Thus, in one sense, it can be seen as a reasonable and expected mobilization of Hittite bias for its own ends. But it can hardly be doubted that the initial extension of this type of policy was enacted for political reasons. It only occurred when Emar became politically significant vis-à-vis Assyria. At this propitious moment, the Hittite regime took interest and expanded its religious policies to Emarite religious practices, bringing them into at least a formal alignment with their own. It need not reflect a calculated attempt to manipulate the ideology of subjects for the purposes of control. It may instead follow the observation through experience that management of cult translated into a more effective relationship between the core empire and province.

It is impossible to know whether, in the case of Emar, the Hittite/Karkamiš attempt to exert power through ritual was actually effective. One cannot measure whether Emarite citizens ever changed their perspectives on their place in the world as a consequence of change in their ritual structure. On one hand, the Karkamiš system of governance in tandem with the local monarchy lasted for the better part of the 13th century, which implies a successful balance of power ultimately in favor of the foreign

rulers. If any part of that can be attributed to the program of cultic and ritual interference, then the policy would have undoubtedly been effective in terms of power production.

But, on the other hand, as I have already emphasized, the type of ritual under examination here is best understood not a unilateral exercise of control but rather an arena of competition for power. Even as the Hittite/Karkamiš authority may have effected some legitimization through ritual, local actors are, at the same time, afforded the opportunity to advance their own agendas in moments of public performance. David Kertzer has especially emphasized the ability of rituals to create a space for the formation of counter-identities, for the conception of alternate political realities, and for the inciting of action against contemporary structures.⁷ These phenomena are possible thanks to the unifying nature of ritual. That tendency towards unification is the very same already observed by Durkheim, but, as Kertzer illustrates, need not imply the sharing of beliefs—which is to say, need not serve only the interests of the reigning status quo.⁸ Public ritual provides a ready-made forum for group organization and, even where no agreement exists among dissenters, the unifying nature of ritual is apt to produce solidarity “without requiring uniformity of belief.”⁹

Neither are ritual participants bound by the symbolic appropriations of the ritual organizers. For ambiguity is the very essence of symbols and, as such, lends them to divergent interpretation by their users.¹⁰ As a result, the very same symbols and the very same rites that may attempt to impart a certain perception upon participants may, in fact,

⁷ Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power*, 178.

⁸ Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power*, 76.

⁹ Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power*, 67.

¹⁰ Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power*, 69.

be received in a drastically different manner, such that they may serve the construction of counter-perceptions.

The *zukru* festival tablet that has been under examination in this work is not a dynamic source for the performance of the ritual. It is a prescriptive account written by agents of empire and influenced by foreign ideals. It tells us how the Diviners, in the employ of Karkamiš, *wanted* the *zukru* to be performed. But it does not relate how the performance actually proceeded; how the participants reacted to the performance, in its modified form; or how the participants might have solidified bonds of resistance as a result of public ritualization, even if the intent of the modifications was to produce a cosmopolitan sense of citizenship. The *zukru*, after all, is a Syrian tradition with a regional history outreaching the domination of the Hittites. Whatever overtures Karkamiš may have made by way of the *zukru*, it may well have miscalculated in supposing that a ritual with such strong nationalistic roots could be commandeered and redirected without evoking backlash. And while we will never be able to gauge that specific reaction or even observe it at all, we do have reason to believe that Emar did abandon its place in the empire some decades prior to the final collapse of the Bronze Age, which brought all contemporary political machinations to a definitive end. As an arena for the competition of power in Hittite Emar, the *zukru* stands out as a potential facilitator of the social conditions necessary for organization of dissent and, ultimately, disengagement from reigning authorities. Whether it ever played such a role in the real social experience of Emar, is beyond what is any longer knowable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, William F. "New Canaanite Historical and Mythological Data." *BASOR* 63 (1936): 23-32.
- Altman, Amnon. "The Išūwa Affair in the Šattiwaza Treaty (CTH 51: A, obv. 10-24) Reconsidered." *UF* 32 (2000): 11-21.
- Annus, Amar. *The God Ninurta in the Mythology and Royal Ideology of Ancient Mesopotamia*. SAAS 14. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2002.
- Archi, Alfonso. "Materiale Epigrafico Ittita da Tell Fray." *SMEA* 22 (1980): 31-34.
- — —. "Imâr au III^{ème} millénaire d'après les archives d'Ebla." *M.A.R.I.* 6 (1990): 21-38.
- — —. "Studies in the Pantheon of Ebla." *OrNS* 63 (1994): 249-56.
- — —. "Cult of the Ancestors and Funerary Practices at Ebla." Pages 5-31 in *(Re)Constructing Funerary Rituals in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Peter Pfälzner et al. Qatna Studien Supplementa Bd.1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012.
- — —. "Ritualization at Ebla." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 13 (2013): 212-37.
- — —. "Aštata: A Case of Hittite Imperial Religious Policy." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 14 (2014): 141-63.
- Arnaud, Daniel. "Les textes d'Emar et la chronologie de la fin du Bronze récent." *Syria* 52 (1975): 87-92.
- — —. "Catalogue des textes cunéiformes trouvés au cours des trois premières campagnes à Meskéné qadimé Ouest (Chantiers A, C, E, et trouvaille de surface)." *AAAS* 25 (1975): 87-93.
- — —. "La bibliothèque d'un devin Syrien à Meskéné-Emar (Syrie)." *CRAI* (1980): 375-88.
- — —. *Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Emar VI.1-2: Textes sumériens et accadiens, planches*. 2 vols. Synthèse 18. Paris: ERC, 1985.
- — —. *Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Emar VI.3: Textes sumériens et accadiens, textes*. Synthèse 18. Paris: ERC, 1986.
- — —. *Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Emar VI.4: Textes de la bibliothèque, transcriptions et traductions*. Synthèse 28. Paris: ERC, 1987.

- — —. “Les Hittites sur le moyen-Euphrate: Protecteurs et Indigènes.” *Hethitica VIII* (1987): 9-27.
- — —. “Religion assyro-babylonienne.” *AEP* 96 (1987): 174-78.
- — —. “Contribution de l’onomastique du Moyen-Euphrate à la connaissance de l’Emarite.” *SEL* 8 (1991): 23-46.
- — —. *Textes syriens de l’âge du bronze récent*. AuOrS 1. Barcelona: Editorial AUSA, 1991.
- — —. “Tablettes de genres divers du moyen-Euphrate.” *SMEA* 30 (1992): 195-245.
- Babcock, Bryan. *Sacred Ritual: A Study of the West Semitic Ritual Calendars in Leviticus 23 and the Akkadian Text Emar 446*. BBR Supp. 9. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2014.
- Balza, Maria. “Witness Lists at Emar. The Syrian Type Tablets.” Pages 71-115 in *Witnessing in the Ancient Near East: i testimoni nella documentazione del Vicino Oriente antico: proceedings of the round table held at the University of Verona, February 15, 2008*. Edited by Nicoletta Bellotto and Simonetta Ponchia. Acta Sileni 2. Padova: SARGON, 2009.
- Barjamovic, Gojko, Thomas Hertel, and Mogens Trolle Larsen. *Ups and Downs at Kanesh: Chronology, History, and Society in the Old Assyrian Period*. PIHANS 120. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. *The Pantheon of Uruk during the Neo-Babylonian Period*. CM 23. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Beckman, Gary. *Hittite Birth Rituals*. StBoT 29. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.
- — —. “The Religion of the Hittites.” *BA* 52 (1989): 98-108.
- — —. “Hittite Administration in Syria in the Light of the Texts from Ḫattuša, Ugarit and Emar.” Pages 41-49 in *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria*. Edited by Mark Chavalas and John Hayes. Malibu: Undena Publications, 1992.
- — —. “Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: The View from Maṣat and Emar.” Pages 19-27 in *Atti del II Congresso internazionale di hittitologia*. Edited by Onofrio Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri, and Clelia Mora. Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore, 1995.
- — —. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. WAW 7. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1996.

- — —. *Textes from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen*. History of the Ancient Near East Monographs 2. Padova: Sargon, 1996.
- — —. “Hittite Chronology.” *Akkadica* 119-120 (2000): 19-32.
- — —. “Sacrifice, Offerings, and Votives: Anatolia.” Pages 336-39 in *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*. Edited by Sarah Iles Johnston. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- — —. “Blood in Hittite Ritual.” *JCS* 63 (2011): 95-102.
- — —. *The babili-Ritual from Hattusa*. MC 19. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014.
- Bell, Catherine. “The Ritual Body and the Dynamics of Ritual Power.” *JRitSt* 4 (1990): 299-313.
- — —. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York; Oxford: University Press, 1992.
- Bellotto, Nicoletta. “Alcune osservazioni sull’istituzione GIŠ.TUKUL a Emar.” *AoF* 29 (2002): 128-145.
- Belmonte Marín, J.A. “Zur Lesung und Deutung von *ina sila.lím ar-ba* in Emar-Texten.” *N.A.B.U.* (1997): 82-83.
- — —. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt. v. Chr.* Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes 12/2. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2001.
- Beyer, Dominique. *Emar IV: Les sceaux*. OBO 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- Bloch, Yigal. “The Order of Eponyms in the Reign of Shalmaneser I.” *UF* 40 (2008): 143-78.
- — —. “Setting the Dates: Re-evaluation of the Chronology of Babylonia in the 14th-11th Centuries B.C.E. and Its Implications for the Reigns of Ramesses II and Hattušili III.” *UF* 42 (2010): 73-84.
- — —. “Studies in Middle Assyrian Chronology and Its Implications for the History of the Ancient Near East in the 13th Century B.C.E.” PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2012.
- Bottéro, Jean. “Les inventaires de Qatna.” *RA* 43 (1949): 1-40.
- — —. “Les inventaires de Qatna (Suite).” *RA* 43 (1949): 137-215.

- Brinkman, J.A. "Appendix: Mesopotamian Chronology of the Historical Period." Pages 335-48 in *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*, by A. Leo Oppenheim. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Brown, Brian. "The Structure and Decline of the Middle Assyrian State: The Role of Autonomous and Nonstate Actors." *JCS* 65 (2013): 97-126.
- Bryce, Trevor. *Life and Society in the Hittite World*. Oxford: University Press, 2002.
- — —. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Carter, Charles. "Hittite Cult Inventories." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1962.
- Charpin, Dominique. "Les archives d'époque 'assyrienne' dans le palais de Mari." *M.A.R.I.* 4 (1985): 243-268.
- — —. "Les malheurs d'un scribe ou de l'inutilité de sumérien loin de Nippur." Pages 7-27 in *Nippur at the Centennial*. Edited by Maria de Jong Ellis. CRAI 35. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1992.
- Chavel, Simeon. "The Face of God and the Etiquette of Eye-Contact: Visitation, Pilgrimage, and Prophetic Vision in Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish Imagination." *JSQ* 19 (2012): 1-55.
- Christiansen, Birgit. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi: Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463*. StBoT 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
- Civil, Miguel. *The Farmer's Instructions: A Sumerian Agricultural Manual*. AuOrS 5. Barcelona: Editorial Ausa, 1994.
- Clay, Albert. *Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Cassite Period*. YOS 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912.
- Clercq, Geetā De. "Die Göttin Ninegal/Bēlet-ekallim nach den altorientalischen Quellen des 3. und 2. Jt. v. Chr." PhD diss, Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg, 2003.
- Cohen, Mark. *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East*. Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 1993.
- — —. *Festivals and Calendars of the Ancient Near East*. Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2015.
- Cohen, Yoram. "A Family Plot: The Zu-Bala Family of Diviners and Hittite Administration in the Land of Aštata." Pages 213-224 in *Acts of the Vth*

International Congress of Hittitology: Çorum, September 02-08, 2002. Edited by Aygül Süel. Ankara: Nokta Ofset, 2005).

— — —. “Public Religious Sentiment and Personal Piety in the Ancient Near Eastern City of Emar during the Late Bronze Age.” *Religion Compass* 1/3 (2007): 329-40.

— — —. *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age*. HSS 59. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

— — —. “The Administration of Cult in Hittite Emar.” *AoF* 38 (2011): 145-57.

— — —. “Aḫi-malik, The Last Overseer in the City of Emar.” Pages 13-23 in *Looking at the Ancient Near East and the Bible through the Same Eyes: Minha LeAhron, A Tribute to Aaron Skaist*. Edited by Kathleen Abraham and Joseph Fleishman. Bethesda, Md.: CDL, 2012.

Cohen, Yoram and Itamar Singer. “A Late Synchronism between Ugarit and Emar.” Pages 129-135 in *Essays on Ancient Israel in its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Na’aman*. Edited by Yairah Amit. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Cohen, Yoram and Lorenzo D’Alfonso. “The Duration of the Emar Archives and the Relative and Absolute Chronology of the City.” Pages 3-25 in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference*. Edited by Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo d’Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen. AOAT 349. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.

Collins, Billie Jean. *The Hittites and Their World*. Atlanta: SBL, 2007.

Cordani, Violetta. “One-year or Five-year War? A Reappraisal of Suppiluliuma’s First Syrian Campaign.” *AoF* 38 (2011): 240-253.

— — —. “Suppiluliuma in Syria after the First Syrian War: The (Non-)Evidence of the Amarna Letters.” Pages 43-64 in *New Results and Questions on the Reign of Suppiluliuma I*. Edited by Stefano de Martino and Jared Miller. Firenze: LoGisma, 2013.

Crowell, Bradley. “The Development of Dagan: A Sketch.” *JANER* 1 (2001): 32-83.

D’Alfonso, Lorenzo. “Syro-Hittite Administration at Emar: New Considerations on the Basis of a Prosopographic Study.” *AoF* 27 (2000): 269-95.

— — —. “Further Studies on the Ini-Tešub Sealing (Part II: A Prosopographic Approach).” *AoF* 28 (2001): 267-75.

- — —. “Die hethitische Vertragstradition in Syrien (14.-12. Jh. v. Chr.).” Pages 303-29 in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur “Deuteronomismus-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Edited by Jan Christian Gertz et al. BZAW 365. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2006.
- — —. “Talmi-šarruma Judge? Some Thoughts on the Jurisdiction of the Kings of Aleppo during the Hittite Empire.” *SMEA* 40 (2007): 159-69.
- — —. “Urban Environment at 13th Century Emar: New Thoughts about the Area A Building Complex.” Pages 65-76 in *Proceedings of the 4th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East, 29 March – 3 April 2004, Freie Universität Berlin*. Vol. 1. Edited by Hartmut Kühne et al. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008.
- — —. “Seeking a Political Space: Thoughts on the Formative Stage of Hittite Administration in Syria.” *AoF* 38 (2011): 163-76.
- Dalley, Stephanie and Beatrice Teissier. “Tablets from the Vicinity of Emar and Elsewhere.” *Iraq* 54 (1992): 83-111.
- Darga, M. “Puduhepa: An Anatolian Queen of the Thirteenth Century B.C.” Pages 939-61 in *Mélanges Mansel (Festschrift Arif Müfid Mansel) II*. Edited by E. Akurgal and U.B. Alkim. Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1974.
- Dassow, Eva von. “Levantine Polities under Mittanian Hegemony.” Pages 11-32 in *Constituent, Confederate, and Conquered Space: The Emergence of the Mittani State*. Edited by Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, Nicole Brisch, and Jesper Eidem. Topoi. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 17. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Démare-Lafont, Sophie. “The King and the Diviner at Emar.” Pages 207-217 in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference*. Edited by Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo d’Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen. AOAT 349. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.
- Démare-Lafont, Sophie and Daniel Fleming. “Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams: Cosmopolitanism and Legal Diversity.” *RA* 109 (2015): 45-77.
- Devecchi, Elena. “A Fragment of a Treaty with Mukiš.” *SMEA* 49 (2007): 207-16.
- Dietler, Michael. “Feasting and Fasting.” Pages 179-94 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion*. Edited by Timothy Insoll. Oxford: University Press, 2012.
- Dietrich, Manfred. “Das Ensetungsritual der Entu von Emar (Emar VI/3, 369).” *UF* 21 (1989): 47-81.

- — —. “Die Parhedra im Pantheon von Emar.” *UF* 29 (1997): 115-22.
- Dietrich, Manfred and Oswald Loretz, “Die Inschrift der Statue des Königs Idimi von Alalah.” *UF* 13 (1981): 201-69.
- Dietrich, Manfred and Walter Mayer. “Hurritische Weihrauch-Beschörungen in ugaritischer Alphabetschrift.” *UF* 26 (1994): 73-112.
- Dietrich, Manfred, Oswald Loretz, and Walter Mayer. “Sikkanum ‘Betyle.’” *UF* 21 (1989): 133-39.
- Di Filippo, Francesco. “Notes on the Chronology of Emar Legal Tablets.” *SMEA* 46 (2004): 175-214.
- Dijk, J. van. “Une insurrection generale au pays le Larša avant l’avenement de Nūr-Adad.” *JCS* 19 (1965): 1-25.
- Dossin, Georges. “La site de la ville de Kahat.” *AAAS* 11-12 (1961-1962): 197-206.
- Draffkorn, Anne. “Hurrians and Hurrian at Alalah: An Ethno-Linguistic Analysis.” PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1959.
- Driel, Govert van. *The Cult of Assur*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 13. Assen, Van Gorcum, 1969.
- Durand, Jean-Marie. “Noms de dieux sumériens à Mari.” *N.A.B.U.* (1987): 7-8.
- — —. *Archives épistolaires de Mari I/1*. ARM 26. Paris: ERC, 1988.
- — —. Review of Daniel Arnaud, *Recherches au Pays d’Aštata, Emar VI, Textes sumériens et accadiens, vol 1, 2 et 3*. *RA* 83 (1989): 163-91.
- — —. Review of Daniel Arnaud, *Recherches au Pays d’Aštata, Emar VI, Textes sumériens et accadiens, vol 1, 2 et 3*. *RA* 84 (1990): 49-85.
- — —. “La cité-état d’Imâr à l’époque des rois de Mari.” *M.A.R.I.* 6 (1990): 39-92.
- — —. “Le mythologème du combat entre le dieu de l’orage et la mer en Mésopotamie.” *M.A.R.I.* 7 (1993): 41-61.
- — —. *Le culte des pierres et les monuments commémoratifs en Syrie amorrite*. Mémoires de *N.A.B.U.* 9. FM 8. Paris: SEPOA, 2005.
- — —. “La fondation d’une lignée royale syrienne. Le geste d’Idrimi d’Alalah” Pages 94-150 in *Le jeune héros: Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d’un thème*

littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien. Edited by Jean-Marie Durand, Thomas Römer and Michel Langlois. OBO 250. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2011.

Durand, Jean-Marie and Francis Joannes. “*kubuddâ’u* à Mari et à Emâr.” *N.A.B.U.* (1990): 53-54.

Durand, Jean-Marie and Lionel Marti. “Chroniques du Moyen-Euphrate 2. Relecture de documents d’Ekalte, Émar et Tuttul.” *RA* 97 (2003): 141-80.

Durand, Jean-Marie and Michaël Guichard. “Les rituels de Mari.” Pages 19-78 in *Recueil d’études à la mémoire de Marie-Thérèse Barrelet*. Edited by Dominique Charpin and Jean-Marie Durand. Mémoires de *N.A.B.U.* 3. FM 3. Paris: Société pour l’étude du Proche-Orient ancien, 1997.

Epstein, Isidore. *The Babylonian Talmud: seder ḳodashim in Three Volumes, volume III*. London: Soncino Press, 1948.

Espak, Peter. *The God Enki in Sumerian Royal Ideology and Mythology*. Dissertationes Theologiae Universitatis Tartuensis 19. Tartu: University Press, 2010.

Faist, Betina. *Der Fernhandel des assyrischen Reiches zwischen dem 14. und 11. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* AOAT 265. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001.

— — —. “Scribal Traditions and Administration at Emar.” Pages 195-205 in *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference*. Edited by Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo D’Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen. AOAT 349. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.

Fales, Frederick Mario. *Prima dell’Alfabeto: la storia della scrittura attraverso testi cuneiformi inediti*. Venice: Erizzo, 1989.

— — —. “Transition: The Assyrians at the Euphrates between the 13th and the 12th Century BC.” Pages 9-40 in *Empires after the Empire: Anatolia, Syria and Assyria after Suppiluliuma II (ca. 1200/800-700 B.C.)*. Edited by Karl Strobel. Collana di studi sulle civiltà dell’Oriente antico 17. Florence: LoGisma, 2011.

Feder, Yitzhaq. “A Levantine Tradition: The Kizzuwatnean Blood Rite and the Biblical Sin Offering.” Pages 101-14 in *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbors in Honour of Itamar Singer*. Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan, and Jared Miller. StBoT 51. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.

Feliu, Lluís. “The Lord of the Offspring.” *AuOr* 17-18 (1999-2000): 197-200.

— — —. *The God Dagan in Bronze Age Syria*. CHANE 19. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- Fijałkowska, Lena. *Le droit de la vente à Emar*. Philippika 64. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2014.
- Fink, Amir. "Where was the Statue of Idrimi Actually Found? The Later Temples of Tell Atchana (Alalakh) Revisited." *UF* 39 (2008): 162-245.
- Finkbeiner, Uwe. "Emar 1999—Bericht über die 3. Kampagne der syrisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen." *BaM* 32 (2001): 41-120.
- — —. "The Samples: Find Context and Meaning for the Chronology of Emar." Pages 257-66 in *Emar after the Closure of the Tabqa Dam*. Edited by Uwe Finkbeiner and Ferhan Sakal. Subartu 25. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.
- Finkbeiner, Uwe and Ferhan Sakal. "Emar 2002—Bericht über die 5. Kampagne der syrisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen." *BaM* 34 (2003): 65-90.
- — —. Introduction to *Emar after the Closure of the Tabqa Dam*. Pages ix-xii. Edited by Uwe Finkbeiner and Ferhan Sakal. Subartu 25. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.
- Fleming, Daniel. "A Limited Kingship: Late Bronze Emar in Ancient Syria." *UF* 24 (1992): 59-71.
- — —. "The Rituals from Emar: Evolution of an Indigenous Tradition in Second-Millennium Syria." Pages 51-61 in *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria*. Edited by Mark Chavalas and John Hayes. BM 25. Malibu: Undena, 1992.
- — —. *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar*. HSS 42. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1992.
- — —. "Baal and Dagan in Ancient Syria." *ZA* 83 (1993): 88-98.
- — —. "Counting Time at Mari and in Early Second Millennium Mesopotamia." *M.A.R.I* 8 (1997): 675-692.
- — —. "The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests." *JBL* 117 (1998): 401-14.
- — —. *Time at Emar: The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's Archive*. MC 11. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- — —. "Emar: On the Road from Harran to Hebron." Pages 222-50 in *Mesopotamia and the Bible: Comparative Explorations*. Edited by Mark Chavalas and Lawson Younger. JSOTSup 341. London: Sheffield, 2002.
- — —. Review of Joan Westenholz, *Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem: The Emar Tablets*. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 45 (2002): 365-75.

- — —. “Schloen’s Patrimonial Pyramid: Explaining Bronze Age Society.” *BASOR* 328 (2002): 73-80.
- — —. *Democracy’s Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- — —. “Textual Evidence for a Palace at Late Bronze Emar.” Pages 101-109 in *Organization, representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg, 20-25 July 2008*. Edited by Gernot Wilhelm. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- — —. “Emar’s *entu* Installation: Revising Ritual and Text Together.” Pages 29-47 in *Texts and Contexts: The Circulation and Transmission of Cuneiform Texts in Social Space*. Edited by Paul Delnero and Jacob Lauinger. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 9. Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.
- — —. Review of Yoram Cohen, *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age* and Matthew Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and Their Tablet Collection*. *JAOS* (forthcoming).
- Fleming, Daniel and Sophie Démare-Lafont, “Tablet Terminology at Emar: ‘Conventional’ and ‘Free Format.’” *AuOr* 27 (2009): 19-26.
- Fox, Joshua. *Semitic Noun Patterns*. HSS 59. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Freu, Jacques. *Histoire du Mitanni*. Collection Kubaba. Série Antiquité 3. Paris: L’Harmattan, 2003.
- Furlani, Giuseppe. “Fest bei den Hettitern.” *RIA* 3 (1957-71): 43-47.
- Gallagher, Jan. “An Extraordinary Everyday for Emar’s Diviner.” Pages 171-81 in *Life and Culture in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by R.E. Averbeck et al. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2003.
- Geertz, Clifford. “Ethos, World View, and the Analysis of Symbols.” *The Antioch Review* 17 (1957): 421-47. Repr. pages 126-41 in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- — —. *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali*. Princeton: University Press, 1980.
- Gelb, Ignace. *Nuzi Personal Names*. OIP 57. Chicago: University Press, 1943.
- Georg von Brandenstein, Carl. *Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten*. MVAG 46/2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1943.

- Goetze, Albrecht. *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*. MVAG 38. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1933.
- — —. *Kizzuwatna and the Problem of Hittite Geography*. YOS Researches 22. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.
- — —. “The Syrian Town of Emar.” *BASOR* 147 (1957): 22-27.
- Grayson, A. Kirk. *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (to 1115 BC)*. RIMA 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Grimes, Ronald. *Beginnings in Ritual Studies*. 3d edition. Waterloo: Ritual Studies International, 2013.
- Gromova, Daria. “The Historical Preamble of the Talmi-Šarruma Treaty (CTH 75) and Some Chronological Problems of the History of Halap.” Pages 101-105 in *Time and History in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona 26-30 July 2010*. Lluís Feliu et al. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Günbatti, Cahit. “Two Treaty Texts Found at Kültepe.” Pages 249-68 in *Assyria and Beyond: Studies presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*. Edited by J.G. Dercksen. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Osten, 2004.
- Gündem, Can Yümni. “Animal Based Subsistence Economy of Emar during the Bronze Age.” Pages 125-76 in *Emar after the Closure of the Tabqa Dam: The Syrian-German Excavations 1996-2002 Volume I: Late Roman and Medieval Cemeteries and Environmental Studies*. Edited by Uwe Finkbeiner and Ferhan Sakal. Subartu 25. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.
- Güterbock, Hans. “An Outline of the Hittite AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival.” *JNES* 19 (1960): 80-89.
- Haas, Volkert. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. HdO 15. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1994.
- — —. *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica: Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
- Haas, Volkert and Liane Jakob-Rost. “Das Festrival des Gottes Telipinu in Hanhana und in Kašha. Ein Beitrag zum hethitischen Festkalender.” *AoF* 11 (1984): 10-91.
- Hallo, William. “The Road to Emar.” *JCS* 18 (1964): 57-88.

- Hararak, Amir. *Assyria and Hanigalbat: A Historical Reconstruction of Bilateral Relations from the Middle of the Fourteenth to the End of the Twelfth Centuries B.C.* TSO 4. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1987.
- Harris, R. "The Journey of the Divine Weapon." Pages 217-24 in *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965*. Edited by H.G. Güterbock and T. Jacobsen. AS 16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 1965.
- Heimpel, Wolfgang. "The Nanshe Hymn." *JCS* 33 (1981): 65-139.
- — —. "ne-saḡ." *N.A.B.U.* (1994): 72-73.
- Helms, Mary. *Ulysses Sail: An Ethnographic Odyssey of Power, Knowledge and Geographical Distance*. Princeton: University Press, 1988.
- Heltzer, Michael. "The Political Institutions of Ancient Emar as Compared with Contemporary Ugarit (13. – Beginning of the 12. Century B.C.E.)." *UF* 33 (2001): 219-36.
- Hoffner, Harry. *Alimenta Hethaeorum; food production in Hittite Asia Minor*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1974.
- Hout, Theo van den. "Maße und Gewichte. Bei den Hethitern." *RLA* 7 (1990): 517-27.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo. "A New Look at the Outline Tablets of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival: The Text-Copy VS NF 12.1." Pages 205-19 in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Gary Beckman, Richard Beal, and Gregory McMahon. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Huehnergard, John. "Five Tablets from the Vicinity of Emar." *RA* 77 (1983): 11-43.
- — —. *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*. HSS 32. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1987.
- — —. *The Akkadian of Ugarit*. HSS 34. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1989.
- — —. *A Grammar of Akkadian, Third Edition*. HSS 45. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001.
- Hundley, Michael. *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly FAT 50*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Hutter, Manfred. "Religion in Hittite Anatolia: Some Comments on 'Volkert Haas *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*.'" *Numen* 44 (1997): 74-90.

- Ikeda, Jun. "A Linguistic Analysis of the Akkadian Texts from Emar: Administrative Texts." PhD diss., Tel Aviv University, 1995.
- — —. "The Akkadian Language of Emar: Texts Related to a Diviner's Family." Pages 33-61 in *Past Links: Studies in the Languages and Cultures of the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Shlomo Isre'el, Itamar Singer, and Ran Zadok. IOS 18. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1998.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. "Mesopotamian Gods and Pantheons." Pages 972-78 in *Encyclopedia Britannica* II (1963). Repr. pages 16-38 in *Toward the Image of Tammuz and Other Essays on Mesopotamian History and Culture*. Edited by William Moran. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Kassian, Alexei, Andrej Korolëv†, and Andrej Sidel'tsev. *Hittite Funerary Ritual: šalliš waštaiš*. AOAT 288. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.
- Kertzer, David. *Ritual, Politics, and Power*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Klengel, Horst. "Einige Bemerkungen zur hethitischen Herrschaftsordnung in Syrien." Pages 255-71 in *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie: Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*. Edited by Gernot Wilhelm. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.
- Kohler, J. and A. Ungad, *Hammurabi's Gesetz Band III: Übersetzte Urkunden Erläuterungen*. Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1909.
- Kraus, Fritz Rudolph. "Ein Sittenkanon in Omenform." *ZA* 43 (1939): 77-113.
- Krebernik, Manfred. "Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der lexikalischen Texte aus Ebla. Teil 2 (Glossar)." *ZA* 73 (1983): 1-47.
- — —. *Die Beschwörungen aus Fara und Ebla. Untersuchungen zur ältesten keilschriftlichen Beschwörungsliteratur*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1984.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. *The Ancient Near East c. 3000-330 BC Volume One*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Lackenbacher, Sylvie. "Nouveaux documents d'Ugarit: I.—une lettre royale." *RA* 76 (1982): 141-56.
- Lafont, Bertrand. "Le roi de Mari et les prophètes du dieu Adad." *RA* 78 (1984): 7-18.
- Lambert, Wilfred. "The Sumero-Babylonian Brick-God Kulla." *JNES* 46 (1987): 203-204.

- Lambert, Wilfred and Alan Millard. *Atra-ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Lane, Edward William. *An Arabic-English Lexicon Part 2*. London; Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1968.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. "Les hieroglyphes de Meskene-Emar et le style 'syro-hittite.'" *Akkadica* 22 (1981): 5-14.
- Lam, Joseph. "A Reassessment of the Alphabetic Hurrian Text RS 1.004 (KTU³ 1.42): A Ritual of Anointing of Deities?" *JANER* 11 (2011): 148-169.
- Lebrun, René. *Samuha: foyer religieux de l'empire hittite*. PIOL 11. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1976.
- Liverani, Mario. *The Ancient Near East: History, Society, and Economy*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Llop-Radua, Jaume. "Did the Assyrians Occupy the Euphrates-elbow in the Middle Assyrian Period (Late Bronze Age)?" Pages 203-226 in *Broadening Horizons 3. Conference of Young Researchers Working in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Ferran Borrell Tena et al. Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Servei de Publicacions, 2012.
- Lukes, Stephen. *Power: A Radical View*. 2d ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Malul, Meir. *Studies in Mesopotamian Legal Symbolism*. AOAT 221. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- Margueron, Jean. "Les fouilles françaises de Meskéné-Émar (Syrie)." *CRAI* (1975): 201-13.
- — —. "Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Emar (1972-1974): un bilan provisoire." *Syria* 52 (1975): 53-85.
- — —. "Une «*ḫilāni*» à Emar." *AASOR* 44 (1977): 153-176.
- — —. "Rapport préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e, 5e, et 6e campagnes de fouilles à Meskéné-Émar." *AAAS* 32 (1982): 233-49.
- Margueron, Jean-Claude and Veronica Boutte. "Emar, Capital of Aštata in the Fourteenth Century BCE." *BA* 58 (1995): 126-38.
- Martino, Stefano de. "Some Questions on the Political History and Chronology of the Early Hittite Empire." *AoF* 37 (2010): 186-197.

- — —. “The Mittani State: The Formation of the Kingdom of Mittani.” Pages 61-74 in *Constituent, Confederate, and Conquered Space: The Emergence of the Mittani State*. Edited by Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, Nicole Brisch, and Jesper Eidem. Topoi, Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 17. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Matthiae, Paolo. “Ittiti ed Assiri a Tell Fray: Lo Scavo di una città Medio-Siriana sull’Eufrate.” *SMEA* 22 (1980): 35-51.
- McClellan, Thomas. “Houses and Household in North Syria During the Late Bronze Age.” Pages 29-60 in *Les maisons dans la Syrie antique du III^e millénaire aux débuts de l’Islam: pratique et représentations de l’espace domestique: actes du Colloque International, Damas, 27-30 juin 1992*. Edited by Corinne Castel et al. Beyrouth: Institut Français d’Archéologie du Proche-Orient, 1997.
- Meeks, Dimitri and Christine Favard-Meeks. *La vie quotidienne des dieux égyptiens*. Paris: Hachette, 1993.
- Merrill, Michael. “Masks, Metaphor and Transformation: The Communication of Belief in Ritual Performance.” *JRitSt* 18 (2004): 16-33.
- Meshel, Naphtali. “Pure, Impure, Permitted, Prohibited: A Study of Classification Systems in P.” Pages 32-42 in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*. Edited by Naphtali Meshel et al. New York, London: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Mettinger, Tryggve. *No Graven Image? Israelite Aniconism in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context*. Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 42. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995.
- Michel, Patrick. “Ritual in Emar.” Pages 187-96 in *Approaching Rituals in Ancient Cultures. Questioni di rito: rituali come fonte di conoscenza delle religioni e delle concezioni del mondo nelle culture antiche, Proceedings of the Conference, Rome, November 28-30, 2011*. Edited by Claus Ambos and Lorenzo Verderame. Supplemento 2 alla Rivista Degli Studi Orientali N.S. 86. Pisa, Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2013.
- — —. *Le culte des pierres à Emar à l’époque hittite*. OBO 266. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
- — —. “Worshipping Gods and Stones.” Pages 53-66 in *Mesopotamia in the ancient world: impact, continuities, parallels: proceedings of the Seventh Symposium of the Melammu Project held in Obergurgl, Austria, November 4-8, 2013*. Edited by Robert Rollinger and Erik van Dongen; Melammu symposia 7. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2015.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 1-16*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

- Miller, Jared. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004.
- — —. “Joins and Duplicates among the Bogazköy Tablets (11-20).” *ZA* 97 (2007): 125-32.
- — —. “Mursili II’s Dictate to Tuppi-Teššub’s Syrian Antagonists.” *Kaskal* 4 (2007): 121-52.
- — —. *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*. WAW 33. Atlanta: SBL, 2013.
- Mitchell, Jon. “Ritual Transformation and the Existential Grounds of Selfhood.” *JRitSt* 23 (2009): 53-66.
- Moran, William. *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1992.
- Mori, Lucia. “The City Gates at Emar. Reconsidering the Use of the Sumerograms KÁ.GAL and KÁ in Tablets Found at Meskené Qadime.” Pages 249-67 in *ana turri gimilli: studi dedicati al padre Werner R. Mayer, S.J., da amici e allievi*. Edited by M.G. Biga and M. Liverani. Quaderni di Vicino Oriente 5. Rome: Università di Roma La Sapienza, 2010.
- Mouton, Alice. “Reinheit (Pureté). B. Bei den Hethitern.” *RLA* 11 (2008): 299-300.
- Na’aman, Nadav. “The Historical Introduction to the Aleppo Treaty Reconsidered.” *JCS* 32 (1980): 34-42.
- Nakamura, Mitsuo. *Das hethitische nuntarriyasha-Fest*. Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 94. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2002.
- Nemirovsky, Alexander. “Synchronism of the Era of Hattusili III and the “Low” Chronology of the Late Bronze Age Century.” *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii*, 2 (2003): 3-15.
- Niedorf, Christian. *Die mittelbabylonischen Rechtsurkunden aus Alalah (Schicht IV)*. AOAT 352. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.
- Novák, Mirko and Peter Pfälzner. “Ausgrabungen in Tall Mišrife-Qatna 1999. Vorbericht der deutschen Komponente des internationalen Kooperationsprojektes.” *MDOG* 132 (2000): 253-96.
- Oliva, Juan. “Aštar šarbat in Ebla.” *N.A.B.U.* (1993): 32-34.
- Otten, Heinrich. “Ein Bestattungsritual hethitischer Könige.” *ZA* 46 (1940): 206-24.

- — —. *Puduḫepa: Eine hethitische Königin in ihren Textzeugnissen*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur: Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, vol. 1975/1. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1975.
- — —. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV.* StBoT 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988.
- Pardee, Dennis. *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. WAW 10. Atlanta: SBL, 2002.
- Penttuc, Eugene. *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar*. HSS 49. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001.
- Pomponio, Francesco and Paolo Xella. *Les dieux d'Ebla: Étude analytique des divinités éblaïtes à l'époque des archives royales du IIIe millénaire*. AOAT 245. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1997.
- Pongratz-Lesiten, Beate. *ina šulmi īrub: die kulttopographische und ideologische Programmatik der akītu-Prozession in Babylonien und Assyrien im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Mainz am Rhein: Von Zabern, 1994.
- Postgate, J. Nicholas. "The Debris of Government: Reconstructing the Middle Assyrian State Apparatus from Tablets and Potsheards." *Iraq* 72 (2010): 19-37.
- Powell, Marvin. "Maße und Gewichte." *RIA* 7 (1990): 457-517.
- Prechel, Doris. "Hethitische Rituale in Emar?" Pages 243-252 in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference*. Edited by Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo d'Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen. AOAT 349. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.
- Pruzsinszky, Regine. *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar*. SCCNH 13. Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2003.
- — —. "Bemerkungen zu institutionellen Veränderungen in Emar in der Spätbronzezeit." Pages 65-77 in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference*. Edited by Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo d'Alfonso, and Dietrich Sürenhagen. AOAT 349. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.
- Rahmouni, Aicha. "The Epithets of the Kôtharātu Goddesses at Ugarit." *AuOr* 30 (2012): 55-73.
- Rainey, Anson. *The El-Amarna Correspondence Volume 1*. HdO 110. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

- Reculeau, Hervé. "Late Bronze Age Rural Landscapes of the Euphrates according to the Emar Texts." Pages 129-40 in *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society; Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference*. Edited by Yoram Cohen, Lorenzo d'Alfonso, and Dietrich Sörenhagen. AOAT 349. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.
- Richter, Thomas. *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*. Wiesbaden: Harroassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- — —. *Das Archiv des Idadda: Die Keilschrifttexte aus den deutsch-syrischen Ausgrabungen 2001-2003 im Königspalast von Qatna*. Qatna-Studien. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2014.
- Ristvet, Lauren. "Travel and the Making of North Mesopotamian Polities." *BASOR* 361 (2011): 1-31.
- — —. *Ritual, Performance, and Politics in the Ancient Near East*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Ritner, Robert. *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*. SAOC 54. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1993.
- — —. "Magic." Pages 191-213 in *The Ancient Gods Speak: A Guide to Egyptian Religion*. Edited by Donald Redford. Oxford: University Press, 2002.
- Rutz, Matthew. *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and Their Tablet Collection*. Ancient Magic and Divination 9. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Sallaberger, Walther. Review of Daniel Fleming, *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar*, *ZA* 86 (1996): 140-147.
- — —. "Das Erscheinen Marduks als Vorzeichen: Kultstatue und Neujahrsfest in der Omenserie Šumma ālu." *ZA* 90 (2000): 227-262.
- Salonen, Armas. *Notes on Wagons and Chariots in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1950.
- Salvini, Mirjo. *Les textes hourrites de Meskéné/Emar. Vol. I: Transcription, autographies, planches photographiques*. Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2015.
- Salvini, Mirjo and Marie-Claude Trémouille, "Les textes hittites de Meskéné/Emar." *SMEA* 45 (2003): 225-71.

- Sasson, Jack. "Zimri-Lim Takes the Grand Tour." *BA* 47/4 (1984): 246-51.
- Sawadzki, Stefan. *Garments of the Gods: Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar According to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive*. OBO 218. Fribourg: Academic Press, 2006.
- Schwemer, Daniel. *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen: Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.
- Seaquist, Carl. "Ritual Individuation and Ritual Change." *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 21 (2009): 340-360.
- Selz, Gebhard. "ne-saġ, bur- saġ und gú-ne(-saġ-ġa): Zu zwei Gefässbezeichnungen, ihren Bedeutungs-entwicklungen und einem sumerischen Wort für (Gefäß)schrank." *SEL* 13 (1996): 3-8.
- Seminara, Stefano. *L'accadico di Emar*. Materiali per il vocabolario sumerico 6. Roma: Università degli studi di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di studi orientali, 1998.
- Sigrist, Marcel. "Seven Emar Tablets." Pages 165-85 in *kinattūtu ša dārāti: Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*. Edited by Anson Rainey. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University, 1993.
- Singer, Itamar. *The Hittite KILAM Festival: Part One*. StBoT 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.
- — —. *Hittite Prayers*. WAW 11. Atlanta: SBL, 2002.
- Skaist, Aaron. "A Hurrian Term at Emar." Pages 169-71 in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 10/2*. Edited by David Owen and Gernot Wilhelm. SCCNH 9. Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 1998.
- — —. "The Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar." *ZA* 88 (1998): 45-71.
- — —. "When Did Ini-Tešub Succeed to the Throne of Carchemish?" *UF* 37 (2005): 609-19.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "The Bare Facts of Ritual." *History of Religions* 20 (1980): 124-25.
- Smith, Sidney. *The Statue of Idri-mi*. Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara 1. London: British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, 1949.
- Soden, Wolfram von. *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*. 3d edition. Analecta Orientalia 33. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1995.

- Sommer, Ferdinand and Hans Ehelolf. *Das hethitische Ritual des Papanikri von Komana*. BoSt 10. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1924.
- Soubeyran, Denis. "Une graphie atypique de Saggarātum?" *M.A.R.I.* 3 (1984): 276.
- Spaey, Johanna. "Emblems in Rituals in the Old Babylonian Period." Pages 411-20 in *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by J. Quaegebeur. OLA 55. Louvain: Peeters, 1993.
- Stern, Phillip. *The Biblical Herem: A Window on Israel's Religious Experience*. BJS 211. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1991.
- Stökl, Jonathan. "The מתנבאות in Ezekiel 13 Reconsidered." *JBL* 132 (2013): 61-76.
- Stol, Marten. *On Trees, Mountains, and Millstones in the Ancient Near East*. MVEOL 21. Leiden: Ex Oriente Lux, 1979.
- Strauß, Rita. *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Streck, Michael. "Dattelpalme und Tamariske in Mesopotamien nach dem akkadischen Streitgespräch." *ZA* 94 (2004): 250-90.
- Taggar-Cohen, Ada. *Hittite Priesthood*. THeth. 26. Heidelberg: Winter, 2006.
- Taracha, Piotr. *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia*. DBH 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009.
- Tenu, A. "Du Tigre à l'Euphrate: la frontiere occidentale de l'empire médioassyrien." *SAAB* 15 (2006): 161-181.
- Thureau-Dangin, François. "Un comptoir de laine pourpre à Ugarit d'après une tablette de Ras-Shamra." *Syria* 15 (1934): 137-46.
- Toorne, Karel van der. "The Significance of the Veil in the Ancient Near East." Pages 327-39 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by D. Wright, D.N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Töyräänvuori, Joanna. "Weapons of the Storm God in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Traditions." *StOr* 112 (2012): 147-180
- Tsukimoto, Akio. "Eine neue Urkunde des Tili-Šarruma, Sohn des Königs von Karkamiš." *ASJ* 6 (1984): 65-74.

- — —. “Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (I).” *ASJ* 12 (1990): 177-259.
- — —. “Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (II).” *ASJ* 13 (1991): 275-333.
- — —. “Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (III).” *ASJ* 14 (1992): 311-15.
- Versluis, Arie. “Devotion and/or Destruction? The Meaning and Function of חרם in the Old Testament.” *ZAW* 128 (2016): 233-46.
- Vidal Palomino, Jordi. “El Rey de Emar en la fiesta zukru.” Pages 102-109 in *De la estepa al Mediterráneo : actas del 1er Congreso de Arqueología e Historia Antigua del Oriente Próximo, Barcelona, 3-5 de Abril de 2000*. Edited by Juan-Luis Montero Fenollós et al. Barcelona: Eridu, 2001.
- — —. “Prestige Weapons in an Amorite Context.” *JNES* 70/2 (2011): 247-52.
- Vidal, Juan-Pablo. “Warfare and the Army at Emar.” *AoF* 29 (2002): 113-27.
- Waetzoldt, Hartmut. “Rind. A.” *RLA* 11 (2008): 375-88.
- Wegner, Ilsa. *Gestalt und Kult der Ištar-Šawuška in Kleinasien*. AOAT 36. Hurritological Studien 3. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1981.
- — —. *Einführung in die hurritische Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000.
- Weidner, Ernst. *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien: die staatsverträge in akkadischer sprache aus dem archiv von Boghazköi*. BoSt 8. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1923; repr. 1970.
- Westbrook, Raymond. “Old Babylonian Period.” Pages 361-430 in *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law. Volume 1*. Edited by Raymond Westbrook. HdO 72. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Westenholz, Joan. “Emar—The City and its God.” Pages 145-67 in *Languages and Cultures in Contact: At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm, Proceedings of the 42nd RAI*. Karel van Lerberghe and Fabriela Voet. OLA 96. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- — —. *Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem: The Emar Tablets*. CM 13. Gronigen: Styx Publications, 2000.
- Wiggermann, Franz. “Agriculture as Civilization: Sages, Farmers, and Barbarians.” Pages 663-89 in *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Edited by Karen Radner and Eleanor Robson. Oxford: University Press, 2011.

Wilcke, Claus. "AH, die Brüder von Emar. Untersuchungen zur Schreibtradition am Euphratknie." *AuOr* 10 (1992): 115-50.

Wiseman, Donald. *The Alalakh Tablets*. Occasional publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 2. London, British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953.

Worthington, M. "Salbung." *RIA* 11 (2008): 574-75.

Yamada, Masamichi. "'Arana-Documents' from Emar." *Orient* 29 (1993): 139-46.

— — —. "The Dynastic Seal and Ninurta's Seal: Preliminary Remarks on Sealing by the Local Authorities of Emar." *Iraq* 56 (1994): 59-62.

— — —. "The Hittite Social Concept of 'Free' in Light of the Emar Texts." *AoF* 22 (1995): 297-316.

— — —. "The Family of Zū-Ba'la the Diviner and the Hittites." Pages 323-34 in *Past Links: Studies in the Languages and Cultures of the Ancient Near East Dedicated to Professor Anson F. Rainey*. Edited by Shlomo Izre'el, Itamar Singer, and Ran Zadok. IOS 18. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1998.

— — —. "The Hittite Administration in Emar: The Aspect of Direct Control." *ZA* 96 (2006): 222-34.

— — —. "The *zukru* Festival in Emar: On Royal Cooperation with the City." *Orient* 45 (2010): 111-28.

— — —. "The *zukru* Festival and Its Preparatory Rituals in Emar VI 373: Their Schedule, Procedure and Gods." *Orient* 46 (2011): 141-160.

— — —. "The Chronology of the Emar Texts Reassessed." *Orient* 48 (2013): 125-56.

Yon, Marguerite. *The City of Ugarit at Tell Ras Shamra*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Zadok, Ran. "Notes on the West Semitic Material from Emar." *AION* 51 (1991): 113-37.

Curriculum Vitae

John Tracy Thames, Jr. was born on January 2, 1983 in Alexandria, Louisiana. He studied Philosophy and Religious Studies with a focus on Jewish Studies at Louisiana State University, graduating *magna cum laude* in 2004. He returned to LSU for graduate study in philosophy, earning a Master of Arts degree in 2008, before moving to New Haven, Connecticut to study at the Yale University Divinity School, where he earned a Master of Arts in Religion specialized in the Hebrew Bible in 2010. That same year, he began doctoral studies at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland in the Department of Near Eastern Studies. During his graduate studies, John has taught or assisted teaching classes at Yale Divinity School, the University of Connecticut, and St. Thomas Seminary in Bloomfield, Connecticut.